arXiv:1207.2118v1 [math.ST] 9 Jul 2012

Testing equality of functions under monotonicity constraints

Cécile Durot and Hendrik P. Lopuhaä

July 10, 2012

Abstract

We consider the problem of testing equality of functions $f_j : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ the basis of J independent samples from possibly different distributions under the assumption that the functions are monotone. We provide a uniform approach that covers testing equality of monotone regression curves, equality of monotone densities and equality of monotone hazards in the random censorship model. Two test statistics are proposed based on L_1-distances. We show that both statistics are asymptotically normal and we provide bootstrap implementations, which are shown to have critical regions with asymptotic level α.

1 Introduction

A classical statistical problem is the k-sample problem, where one has to decide whether different samples can be regarded as coming from the same population. In the non-parametric setting, [41] and [42] introduced the first two-sample tests, one based on the distance between the empirical distribution functions of the two samples and one based on ranks. Generalizations of these methods to the k-sample problem, with $k \geq 2$, are given in [22] and [27], respectively. Although Wilcoxon-type tests remain very popular, they are known to be able to detect only a limited range of alternatives. To overcome this difficulty, several solutions have been proposed. For an overview and references on this topic, see [19], who developed a two-sample test inspired by the smooth Neymann test, in which the problem is reparametrized and modeled via some multivariate exponential family with an unknown parameter in such a way that the two-sample problem amounts to testing that this parameter is zero. Another recent approach consist of comparing empirical characteristic functions, e.g., see [17], who extended the univariate two-sample tests from [10] and [33] to the multivariate k-sample setting, $k \geq 2$. For procedures based on comparing kernel density estimators, see Anderson, Hall and Titterington [1], who consider the L_2-distance in the multivariate two sample setting, and [32], who uses the L_1- and the L_∞-distance, and see [5] and references therein, for methods based on empirical likelihood. A generalization of the Smirnov test to the case of multivariate observations is considered in [4, 36], among others. See also [3, 2, 21] for more references on multivariate k-sample tests. The recent paper by [21] points out that most of the rank based tests proposed in the literature, unless one-sided, could be biased against alternatives of interest. In that paper, multivariate distribution free two-sample tests, based on the ranks of suitable distances of multivariate observations, are developed. Unbiasedness and power of those tests are studied against Lehmann alternatives.

The k-sample problem arises naturally in survival analysis, where the observations are typically right censored. Various two-sample tests inspired by the Wilcoxon test have been proposed for right censored data, see [15, 20, 40] and references therein. Other approaches are based for instance on comparison of quantile estimators, see Li, Tiwari and Welles [31].

The k-sample problem also arises in the regression setting. For instance, in medical studies one wishes to compare the mean response of a treatment group of subjects to that of a control group, taking into account a covariate such as the dose of drug. In such cases, one wishes to compare two or more regression curves. In this setting, [14] developed a two-sample test calibrated by the bootstrap. The test statistic, which is essentially a scaled version of an integrated L_2-distance between smooth estimators of the regression curves (see also King, Hart and Wehrly [25]), is based on differences between the response variables at given values of the covariate. Another two-sample test based on these differences, which in spirit resembles the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, is proposed in [7]. In the case where the covariate values as well as the sample size possibly differ in the two considered samples, [28] developed a test based on quasi-residuals. In this setting with possibly heteroscedastic errors, [34] consider a test based on the estimation of the L_2-distance between the two regression curves and generalized the method to the case of k-samples, $k \geq 2$, whereas [35] developed a test calibrated by the bootstrap, which is based on the difference of two marked empirical processes. Most of the aforementioned procedures involve the choice of a tuning parameter.

Nonparametric methods for k-sample problems under shape constraints are quite limited. [12] considers likelihood ratio type two-sample tests in the current status model, which is closely related to other shape constrained nonparametric models. The test statistics are shown to be asymptotically normal under the null hypothesis of equal distributions and the test is calibrated using the bootstrap. The problem of comparing two monotone fractile regression functions, which is similar in spirit to the problem of comparing two monotone regression functions, is considered by [39]. A test based on the L_2-distance between two monotone estimators is discussed. The test is calibrated by the bootstrap, but no limit distribution is provided.

The above mentioned testing problems have one common feature, i.e., they essentially test the equality of two or more functions in various sorts of statistical models, e.g., distribution functions, densities, characteristic functions, hazard rates, or regression curves. In this paper we consider the following testing problem

$$H_0 : f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : f_i \neq f_j \text{ for some } i \neq j$$

subject to the constraint that $f_j : [0,1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is decreasing for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$. This general framework includes a k-sample test for samples from a decreasing density and a test for equality of decreasing regression curves or decreasing hazard rates. We propose two test statistics based on L_1-distances between non-parametric Grenander-type estimators $\widehat{f}_{nj}$. The first one compares mutual distances between the different individual estimators

$$S_{n1} = \sum_{i<j} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1}$$

The second one compares the distances between each individual $\widehat{f}_{nj}$ and a pooled estimator $\widehat{f}_{n0}$ for the mutual f_0 under the null hypothesis:

$$S_{n2} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{nj}(t) - \widehat{f}_{n0}(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t. \tag{2}$$

We show that both test statistics are asymptotically normal and propose a bootstrap procedure to calibrate the test. Finally, we discuss the special cases of testing equality of monotone regression functions, monotone densities and monotone hazards rates under random censorship, and show in each of these cases that the bootstrap works.

In Section 2 we describe the general setup, state our main results, and discuss the differences between the approach in this paper and the ones used in Groeneboom, Hooghiemstra and Lopuhaä [13], [29] and [9] to prove similar results. In Section 3 we discuss the implementation of the test and show that the bootstrap works in the previous mentioned statistical models. All proofs are postponed to an appendix at the end of the paper.

2 Main results

For estimating the functions $f_j : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$, we suppose that for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$,

$$F_j(t) = \int_0^t f_j(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \tag{3}$$

is well defined and that we have an estimator F_{nj} at hand based on n_j observations. We denote by $n = \sum_j n_j$ the total number of observations and for notational convenience (and possibly arguing along subsequences), we assume that $n_j = c_j \cdot n$ where $c_j > 0$ does not depend on n. Thus, $\sum_j c_j = 1$. Denote f_0 and F_0 for the corresponding quantities under the null hypothesis, where we estimate F_0 by

$$F_{n0} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j F_{nj}. \tag{4}$$

Then, for all $j = 0, 1 \ldots, J$, we define $\widehat{f}_{nj}$ as the left-hand slope of the least concave majorant of F_{nj}, with $\widehat{f}_{nj}(0) = \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \widehat{f}_{nj}(t)$. We will frequently make use of results from [13] and [9]. Similar to these papers, we will work under the following assumptions:

(A0) The estimators $F_{n1}, F_{n2}, \ldots, F_{nJ}$ are independent and for every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, the estimator $F_{nj} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is a cadlag step process.

(A1) For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, the function $f_j : [0,1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is decreasing and continuously differentiable, such that $0 < \inf_{t\in[0,1]} |f_j'(t)| \leq \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |f_j'(t)| < \infty$.

(A2) For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, there exists a constant $C_j > 0$, such that for all $x \geq 0$ and $t = 0, 1$, the process $M_{nj} = F_{nj} - F_j$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u\in[0,1],\, x/2\leq|t-u|\leq x} \left(M_{nj}(t) - M_{nj}(u)\right)^2\right] \leq \frac{C_j x}{n_j}.$$

Futhermore, we assume that there exists an embedding either into Brownian motion or into Brownian bridge.

(A3) For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, there exists a Brownian motion or Brownian bridge B_{nj}, an increasing function $L_j : [0,1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with $\inf_t L_j'(t) > 0$, and constants $q > 6$ and $C > 0$, such that for all $x \in (0, n_j]$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ n_j^{1-1/q} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| M_{nj}(t) - n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj} \circ L_j(t) \right| > x \right\} \leq C x^{-q}.$$

It should be noticed that, since the F_{nj} are assumed to be independent, we can assume without loss of generality that the B_{nj} are independent. Note that, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, we can write

$$B_{nj}(t) = W_{nj}(t) - \xi_{nj} t, \qquad \text{for } t \in [0,1], \tag{5}$$

where the W_{nj} are independent Brownian motions and $\xi_{nj} \equiv 0$, if B_{nj} is Brownian motion, and $\xi_{nj} \sim N(0,1)$ independent of B_{nj}, if B_{nj} is Brownian bridge. Finally, we require the following smoothness assumption.

(A4) There exist an $\alpha \in (3/4, 1]$ and $C > 0$, such that for all $x, y \in [0,1]$ and $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$,

$$|f_j'(x) - f_j'(y)| \le C|x-y|^\alpha \text{ and } |L_j''(x) - L_j''(y)| \le C|x-y|^\alpha.$$

These are the usual assumptions when studying the L_p-error of isotonic estimators. It is explained in [9] that several classical models are covered by the above general framework. As an example we mention the model where one observes J independent samples where the random variables in the jth sample have a decreasing smooth density function f_j. In this example, F_{nj} is the empirical distribution function based on the jth sample and $L_j = F_j$. This example will be studied in detail in Section 3.3. Two other examples, where f_j is either a regression function or a failure rate, are studied in Sections 3.2 and 3.4.

Our main result is that under the above assumptions both test statistics defined in (1) and (2) are asymptotically Gaussian under the null hypothesis. In order to formulate these results more precisely, we introduce the random variables

$$\zeta_j(c) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ W_j(u+c) - u^2 \right\}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, J, \tag{6}$$

where the argmax function is the supremum of the times at which the maximum is attained, $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_J$ are independent standard two-sided Brownian motions. We are now in the position to establish asymptotic normality for test statistic S_{n1}.

Theorem 1 *Assume (A0), (A1), (A2), (A3), (A4) and let S_{n1} be defined by* (1). *Let ζ_j be defined in* (6), *for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, with independent standard Brownian motions $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_J$. If $f = f_1 = f_2 = \dots = f_J$, then $n^{1/6}(n^{1/3} S_{n1} - m_1)$ converges in distribution, as $n \to \infty$, to the Gaussian law with mean zero and variance σ_1^2, where*

$$\sigma_1^2 = 8 \sum_{i<j} \sum_{l<m} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \operatorname{cov}\left(|Y_{si}(t) - Y_{sj}(t)|, |Y_{sl}(0) - Y_{sm}(0)| \right) \mathrm{d}t \, \mathrm{d}s,$$

$$m_1 = \sum_{i<j} \int_0^1 (4|f'(s)|)^{1/3} \mathbb{E} \left| Y_{si}(0) - Y_{sj}(0) \right| \mathrm{d}s,$$

with

$$Y_{sj}(t) = \frac{L_j'(s)^{1/3}}{c_j^{1/3}} \zeta_j \left(\frac{c_j^{1/3} t}{L_j'(s)^{1/3}} \right), \tag{7}$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$.

In the special case where all $L_j = L$ are the same, after change of variables $u = t/L(s)^{1/3}$, we find

$$\sigma_1^2 = 8\int_0^1 L'(s)\,\mathrm{d}s \sum_{i<j}\sum_{l<m}\int_0^\infty \mathrm{cov}\left(\left|\frac{\zeta_i(c_i^{1/3}u)}{c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\zeta_j(c_j^{1/3}u)}{c_j^{1/3}}\right|, \left|\frac{\zeta_i(0)}{c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\zeta_j(0)}{c_j^{1/3}}\right|\right)\mathrm{d}u$$

$$m_1 = \int_0^1 |4f'(s)L'(s)|^{1/3}\,\mathrm{d}s \sum_{i<j}\mathbb{E}\left|\frac{\zeta_i(0)}{c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\zeta_j(0)}{c_j^{1/3}}\right|.$$

This resembles the normalizing constants in Theorem 2 in [9] for the case $p = 1$. An example is the monotone density model, where under the null hypothesis $L_j' = f_j = f$, in which case m_1 and σ_1^2 coincide with the normalizing constants in Theorem 1.1 in [13]. In particular, the limiting variance σ_1^2 does not depend on the underlying density f. Another example is the monotone regression model, where $L_j(t) = t\tau_j^2$, with τ_j^2 being the variance of the measurement error. When all the error variances are the same, m_1 and σ_1^2 coincide with the normalizing constants in Theorem 2 in [8].

To establish a similar result for S_{n2} is more complex, due to the fact that we have to deal with differences between a marginal estimator $\widehat{f}_{ni}$ and the pooled estimator $\widehat{f}_{n0}$, which are both (partly) build from the same ith sample. First of all, we need that, under the null hypothesis $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$, the above assumptions also hold to some extent for $j = 0$. Clearly, assumption (A0) then becomes irrelevant and (A1) is immediate, as well as the first part of (A4). Because, under the null hypothesis,

$$M_{n0}(t) = F_{n0}(t) - F_0(t) = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j(F_{nj}(t) - F_j(t)) = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j M_{nj}(t), \tag{8}$$

the inequality (Jensen)

$$(a_1 + \cdots + a_k)^2 \leq k(a_1^2 + \cdots + a_k^2), \tag{9}$$

yields that also (A2) holds for $j = 0$. The remaining assumptions require the definitions of L_0 and B_{n0}. To have (A3) for $j = 0$, we need to show that M_{n0} can be approximated by $n^{-1/2}B_{n0}\circ L_0$, for a given increasing function $L_0 : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\inf_{t\in[0,1]} L_0'(t) > 0$ and a Gaussian process B_{n0}. From relation (8) and assumption (A3), for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, it follows that we then must have

$$B_{n0}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^{1/2} B_{nj}\circ L_j \circ L_0^{-1}(t). \tag{10}$$

Furthermore, when $B_{nj} = W_{nj}$, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ in (A3), then

$$B_{n0}\circ L_0(t) = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j^{1/2} W_{nj}\circ L_j(t) \overset{d}{=} W\left(\sum_{j=1}^J c_j L_j(t)\right),$$

where W denotes Brownian motion. Hence, using the monotonicity of L_j, for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, from comparing the covariance functions, it follows that we must have

$$L_0(t) = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j L_j(t). \tag{11}$$

This L_0 is increasing such that $\inf_{t\in[0,1]} L_0'(t) > 0$ and the second part of (A4) for $j = 0$ follows immediately from the one for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Note that, in contrast to B_{nj}, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, the process B_{n0} is not necessarily a Brownian motion or a Brownian bridge. However, we do have the following version of condition (A3).

Lemma 1 *Assume (A3) and suppose $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Let B_{n0} and L_0 be defined by* (10) *and* (11), *and let $M_{n0} = F_{n0} - F_0$, where F_{n0} is defined in* (4). *Then, there exists $C > 0$, such that for all $x \in (0, n]$:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{ n^{1-1/q} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| M_{n0}(t) - n^{-1/2} B_{n0} \circ L_0(t) \right| > x \right\} \leq C x^{-q}. \tag{12}$$

Now that we have established assumptions (A0)-(A4) for the pooled estimator, we proceed by introducing a suitable variable, such as the one defined in (6), for the case $j = 0$. However, this case is more complex and we have to distinguish between two of them. First, for each fixed $t \in [0, 1]$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}(c) &= \operatorname*{argmax}_{u\in\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \widetilde{W}_{t0}(u + c) - u^2 \right\}, \\ \widehat{\zeta}_{t0}(c) &= \operatorname*{argmax}_{u\in\mathbb{R}} \left\{ \widehat{W}_{t0}(u + c) - u^2 \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{W}_{t0}(u) &= \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left(\frac{c_j L_j'(t)}{L_0'(t)} \right)^{1/2} W_j(u) \\ \widehat{W}_{t0}(u) &= \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j^{1/2} W_j \left(n^{1/3} \left\{ L_j \circ L_0^{-1}(L_0(t) + n^{-1/3}u) - L_j(t) \right\} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

with $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_J$ being the independent standard Brownian motions used to define (6) and L_0 defined in (11). Note that for $t \in [0, 1]$ fixed, due to (11), the processes $\widetilde{W}_{t0}$ and $\widehat{W}_{t0}$ are distributed as standard Brownian motion, which means that $\widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}(c)$ and $\widehat{\zeta}_{t0}(c)$ have the same distribution as $\zeta_j(c)$. We are now in the position to formulate our second main theorem.

Theorem 2 *Assume (A0), (A1), (A2), (A3), (A4) and let S_{n2} be defined by* (2). *Let ζ_j, $\widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}$ and $\widehat{\zeta}_{t0}$ be defined in* (6) *and* (13), *respectively, with independent standard Brownian motions $W_1, W_2, \dots, W_J$. If $f = f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$, then $n^{1/6}(n^{1/3} S_{n2} - m_{n2})$ converges in distribution, as $n \to \infty$, to the Gaussian law with mean zero and variance σ_2^2, where*

$$\sigma_2^2 = 8 \sum_{i=1}^{J} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \operatorname{cov}\left(|Y_{si}(t) - Y_{s0}(t)|, |Y_{sj}(0) - Y_{s0}(0)| \right) \mathrm{d}t \, \mathrm{d}s,$$

with Y_{sj} defined in (7) *and*

$$Y_{s0}(t) = L_0'(s)^{1/3} \widetilde{\zeta}_{t0} \left(\frac{t}{L_0'(s)^{1/3}} \right). \tag{15}$$

Furthermore,

$$m_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \int_0^1 (4|f'(t)|)^{1/3} \mathbb{E} \left| L_0'(t)^{1/3} \widehat{\zeta}_{t0}(0) - \frac{L_j'(t)^{1/3}}{c_j^{1/3}} \zeta_j(0) \right| \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

If in addition, $L_j = a_j L$, for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, for a given function $L : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ and given real numbers a_j, then $\widehat{\zeta}_{t0} = \widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}$ and m_2 no longer depends on n.

The difference between the limiting bias m_2 and $\mathbb{E}(n^{1/3} S_{n2})$ will be shown to be of the order $o(n^{-1/6})$. Although $\widehat{\zeta}_{t0}(0)$ can be approximated further by $\widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}(0)$, this approximation is not sufficiently strong to cancel the factor $n^{1/6}$. This difficulty does not play a role for $\mathrm{var}(n^{1/3} S_{n2})$, for which we only need a consistent approximation. For this reason the limiting bias m_2 may still depend on n, whereas the limiting variance σ_2^2 is independent of n. Only in specific cases, such as $L_j = a_j L$, the limiting bias will also not depend on n. Examples are the monotone density model, where under the null hypothesis $L_j = f_j = f$, and the monotone regression model, where $L_j(t) = t\tau_j^2$.

The explicit expressions for the normalizing constants in Theorems 1 and 2 are intractable for the purpose of building a statistical test because they depend on the f_j's and the L_j's in a complicated manner. Therefore, in order to implement our statistical test, we prefer to approximate the limit distribution of our test statistics using bootstrap methods, as described in the following section.

Before doing so, we believe it is useful to give the main line of reasoning used to prove Theorems 1 and 2 and explain the main differences with the type of argument used to prove similar results in [13], [29] and [9]. When we define

$$W_{n0}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j^{1/2} W_{nj} \circ L_j \circ L_0^{-1}(t), \tag{16}$$

$$\xi_{n0}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j^{1/2} \xi_{nj} L_j \circ L_0^{-1}(t), \tag{17}$$

with B_{n0} and L_0 defined by (10) and (11), respectively, then similar to (5), also $B_{n0}(t) = W_{n0}(t) - \xi_{n0}(t)$, where the process $W_{n0}(t)$ is a standard Brownian motion and ξ_{n0} is independent of B_{n0}. For every $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, define

$$\begin{aligned} F_{nj}^E(t) &= F_{nj}(t), \\ F_{nj}^B(t) &= n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj}(L_j(t)) + F_j(t), \\ F_{nj}^W(t) &= n_j^{-1/2} W_{nj}(L_j(t)) + F_j(t). \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

and for $S = E, B, W$

$$F_{n0}^S(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j F_{nj}^S(t). \tag{19}$$

Obviously, F_{nj}^E is the estimator for (3) or (4) and, although F_{nj}^B and F_{nj}^W are not estimators in the sense that they are built from observations, we can define the corresponding slope processes

$$\widehat{f}_{nj}^S(t) = \text{left slope of the least concave majorant (LCM) of } F_{nj}^S(u) \text{ at } u = t, \tag{20}$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ and $S = E, B, W$. When investigating the asymptotic behavior of $\widehat{f}^E_{ni}$, one typically exploits the fact that F^E_{ni} can be approximated by F^W_{ni}, using (A3) and (18). However, if two processes are uniformly close, then the slopes of the concave majorants of both processes are not necessarily uniformly close. For this reason, we introduce the (generalized) inverse of $\widehat{f}^S_{nj}$, defined for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ by $\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) = \sup\{t \in [0,1] : \widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t) \geq a\}$, with the convention that the supremum of an empty set is zero. It is fairly easy to see that

$$\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) = \underset{t\in[0,1]}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left\{ F^S_{nj}(t) - at \right\}, \tag{21}$$

for $a \geq 0$, and that

$$\widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t) \leq a \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) \leq t. \tag{22}$$

This means $\widehat{U}^S_{nj}$ is closely connected to $\widehat{f}^S_{nj}$, but its asymptotic behavior is more tractable because if two processes are close, then also the locations of their maxima are close. For this reason, the approach used in [13], [29] and [9], which is originally due to Groeneboom [11], is to switch from L_p-errors in terms of $\widehat{f}^E_{ni}$ to L_p-errors in terms of $\widehat{U}^E_{ni}$. The next lemma provides such an approximation suitable for our purposes. For $S = E$, this result is similar to Corollary 2.1 in [13], Lemma 2.1 in [29] and equality (21) in [9]. For later purposes, e.g, see (24), we also establish the approximation for the cases $S = B, W$.

Lemma 2 *Assume (A1), (A2), (A3), and suppose $f = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Then for $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ and $S = E, B, W$,*

$$n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t) - \widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t = n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}^S_{ni}(a) - \widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}). \tag{23}$$

Proceeding in the spirit of [13], [29] and [9], the next step would be to replace $\widehat{U}^E_{nj}$ on the right hand side of (23) by $\widehat{U}^W_{nj}$. In statistical models where (A3) holds with B_{nj} being Brownian motion, e.g., the regression model and the random censoring model, this can be done by means of Lemma 5 in [9]. However, in statistical models, where B_{nj} is Brownian bridge rather than Brownian motion, e.g., the density model, this is no longer possible. In such models, the approximation of $\widehat{U}^E_{nj}$ by $\widehat{U}^B_{nj}$ is relatively easy, due to assumption (A3). This assumption will ensure that $F^E_{nj} - F^B_{nj}$ is of order smaller than $n^{-5/6}$, which in turn guarantees that $\widehat{U}^E_{nj} - \widehat{U}^B_{nj}$ will be sufficiently small.

Lemma 3 *Assume (A1), (A3), (A4) and suppose $f = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Then, for each $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, J$,*

$$n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}^E_{nj}(a) - \widehat{U}^B_{nj}(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a = o_p(n^{-1/6}).$$

This result is similar to Corollary 3.1 in [13] for the density model, but is now extended to our general setup. However, it is not possible to establish a similar result for $\widehat{U}^B_{ni}$ and $\widehat{U}^W_{ni}$, because $F^B_{ni} - F^W_{ni}$ is of order $n^{-1/2}$, which is too large. This difficulty is solved in [13], [29] and [9], by subtle use of relationship (5). These approaches apply to the L_p-error in terms of a single inverse $\widehat{U}^B_{ni}$, but they do not extend to our current situation, because the right hand side of (23) involves the L_1-error between two different inverses $\widehat{U}^B_{ni}$ and $\widehat{U}^B_{nj}$.

For our current setup, we solve this problem by returning to the slopes themselves. Whereas closeness of F^E_{nj} and F^B_{nj} is not sufficient to obtain suitable bounds on $\widehat{f}^E_{nj} - \widehat{f}^B_{nj}$, the situation is different for F_{nj}^B and F_{nj}^W. The reason is that the difference between Brownian bridge B_{nj} and Brownian motion W_{nj} is only a straight line. We can then obtain the following the slope equivalent of Corollary 3.3 in [13].

Lemma 4 *Assume (A2), (A3). Then, for* $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J$,

$$n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^B(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^B(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t = n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^W(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^W(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t + o_p(n^{-1/6}),$$

After having established Lemmas 2, 3 and 4, in order to prove Theorems 1 and (2), we will use the following line of reasoning:

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^E(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^E(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^E(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^E(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}) \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^B(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^B(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}) \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^B(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^B(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t + o_p(n^{-1/6}) \qquad (24) \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^W(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^W(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t + o_p(n^{-1/6}) \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^W(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}), \end{aligned}$$

where $f = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Of course, in models where B_{nj} is Brownian motion, then $\widehat{U}_{nj}^B = \widehat{U}_{nj}^W$, so that Lemma 4 becomes irrelevant, and we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^E(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^E(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^E(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^E(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}) \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^W(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}), \end{aligned} \qquad (25)$$

immediately, either using Lemma 5 in [9] or as a special case of Lemma 3. Once the test statistics (1) and (2) can be expressed in terms of integrals

$$n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^W(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)| \, \mathrm{d}a,$$

the proof of asymptotic normality follows the same line of reasoning as used in [13], [29] and [9], using the independent increments property of Brownian motion.

3 Implementation of the test

This section is devoted to the implementation of the test in the three different models that are covered by the general setup. Because the limit distribution of the test statistic under the null hypothesis is intractable, we use a bootstrap procedure to calibrate the test. It is known that the standard bootstrap typically does not work for Grenander-type estimators, e.g., see [26, 38], so we consider here a smoothed Bootstrap. This will require the use of a smooth estimator $\widetilde{f}_n$ which, under the null hypothesis $f_1 = \cdots = f_J = f_0$, satisfies bootstrap versions of assumptions (A0)-(A4). The following general property will be sufficient for our purposes.

(A*) The estimator $\widetilde{f}_n$ is continuously differentiable on $[0, 1]$. Furthermore, there exists an event A_n and real numbers $\alpha \in (3/4, 1]$ and $\varepsilon_n > 0$, such that $\mathbb{P}(A_n) \to 1$ and $n^\gamma \varepsilon_n \to \infty$ for any $\gamma > 0$, as $n \to \infty$, and such that the following two properties hold on A_n:

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |f_0(t) - \widetilde{f}_n(t)| \leq n^{-\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha+3}}/\varepsilon_n \tag{26}$$

and for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$,

$$|\widetilde{f}'_n(x) - \widetilde{f}'_n(y)| \leq |x - y|^\alpha/\varepsilon_n. \tag{27}$$

Condition (27) ensures part of the bootstrap version of assumption (A4), although it is slightly stronger. The factor $1/\varepsilon_n$ has been added, since it is difficult to construct an estimator that satisfies (A4) exactly. However, for our purposes, assumption (27) will have the same effect as assumption (A4), because $n^\gamma \varepsilon_n \to \infty$ for all $\gamma > 0$ (typically one should think of $\varepsilon_n = 1/\log n$). Condition (26) comes naturally from minimax rates considerations for kernel density estimators, in situations where the underlying density satisfies (A4). Bootstrap versions of (A0), (A2), (A3), and the second part of (A4) require the definitions of estimators for F_j and L_j. This will be taken care off in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 for the three different models that are covered by the general setup. The bootstrap version of assumption (A1) is satisfied by any estimator $\widetilde{f}_n$ that satisfies (A*), with probability tending to one. More precisely we have the following general lemma.

Lemma 5 *Assume (A1) and let $\widetilde{f}_n : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be an estimator that satisfies (A*) with $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Then there exist positive numbers C_0, C_1 and an event B_n, such that $\mathbb{P}(B_n) \to 1$, as $n \to \infty$, and on B_n, the function $\widetilde{f}_n$ is decreasing with*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}_n(t) - f_0(t)| = o(n^{-1/3}), \tag{28}$$

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}'_n(t) - f'_0(t)| = o(n^{-1/6}), \tag{29}$$

and

$$C_0 < \inf_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}'_n(t)| \leq \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}'_n(t)| < C_1. \tag{30}$$

By means of an estimator $\widetilde{f}_n$, we aim to build bootstrap versions $S^\star_{nk}$ of test statistics S_{nk}, for $k = 1, 2$, in such a way that under the null hypothesis and conditionally on the original observations, $n^{1/6}(S^\star_{nk} - m_k)$ converges in distribution to the Gaussian law with mean zero and variance σ_k^2, in probability, i.e.,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}^\star \left\{ \frac{n^{1/6}(S^\star_{nk} - m_k)}{\sigma_k} \leq t \right\} - \Phi(t) \right| \to 0, \qquad \text{in probability, as } n \to \infty, \tag{31}$$

where m_k and σ_k^2 are the limit bias and variance given in Theorems 1 and 2, Φ denotes the distribution function of the standard Gaussian law, and $\mathbb{P}^\star$ is the conditional probability given the original observations. In this case, for a fixed level $\alpha \in (0,1)$, one can compute (or merely approximate thanks to Monte-Carlo simulations) the α-upper percentile point $q^\star_{nk}(\alpha)$ of the conditional distribution of $S^\star_{nk}$ and consider the critical region

$$\{S_{nk} > q^\star_{nk}(\alpha)\}\,. \tag{32}$$

If assumptions (A0)–(A4) are fulfilled, then Theorems 1 and 2 together with (31) ensures that the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level α.

Below, we will provide an estimator $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfying (A*) under the null hypothesis in the general framework of Section 2. Subsequently, we provide, in the three different models that are covered by this general framework, a construction of $S^\star_{nk}$ that ensures that the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level α. Note that the estimator in Section 3.1 can be used in all of these three models.

3.1 An estimator for f_0

For simplicity, we assume here that under the null hypothesis, the function $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$ is twice continuously differentiable. We consider a sequence of positive real numbers h_n of the order $n^{-1/5}$ and a kernel function $K : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ supported on $[-1,1]$, which symmetric around zero and three times continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$, such that $\int K(t)\,\mathrm{d}t = 1$. Based on h_n and K, we define $\widetilde{f}_n$ as the first derivative of the following smooth version of F_{n0}. For every $t \in [h_n, 1-h_n]$, define

$$\widetilde{F}_n(t) = \frac{1}{h_n}\int_{\mathbb{R}} F_{n0}(x) K\left(\frac{t-x}{h_n}\right)\mathrm{d}x, \tag{33}$$

for every $t \in [0, h_n]$, define

$$\widetilde{F}_n(t) = \widetilde{F}_n(h_n) + (t-h_n)\widetilde{f}_n(h_n) + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{f}'_n(h_n)(t-h_n)^2 + \frac{1}{6}(t-h_n)^3\widetilde{f}''_n(h_n), \tag{34}$$

and for every $t \in [1-h_n, 1]$, define

$$\widetilde{F}_n(t) = \widetilde{F}_n(u_n) + (t-u_n)\widetilde{f}_n(u_n) + \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{f}'_n(u_n)(t-u_n)^2 + \frac{1}{6}(t-u_n)^3\widetilde{f}''_n(u_n), \tag{35}$$

where $u_n = 1-h_n$. Note that for $t \in [h_n, 1-h_n]$:

$$\widetilde{f}_n(t) = \widetilde{F}'_n(t) = \frac{1}{h_n^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} F_{n0}(x)K'\left(\frac{t-x}{h_n}\right)\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{h_n}\int_{\mathbb{R}} K\left(\frac{t-x}{h_n}\right)\mathrm{d}F_{n0}(x),$$

so that $\widetilde{f}_n$ is a kernel type estimator, modified at the boundaries in such a way that for $l = 0,1,2$, the derivative $\widetilde{f}^{(l)}_n$ properly estimates the derivative $f^{(l)}$ on the whole interval $[0,1]$, whereas the simple kernel estimator may show difficulties at the boundaries. The following lemma guarantees that this $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfies condition (A*).

Lemma 6 *For $t \in [0,1]$, let $\widetilde{f}_n(t) = \widetilde{F}'_n(t)$, where $\widetilde{F}_n$ is defined by (33), (34) and (35). If $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$ is twice continuously differentiable on $[0,1]$ and (A3) holds with $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} L'_j(t) < \infty$, for each $j = 1,2,\ldots,J$, then $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfies (A*).*

We end this section, by discussing possible estimators F_{nj} in the three models that are covered by our setup. Furthermore, for these models, we propose bootstrap versions of our test statistic for which we show that the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level α. It suffices to specify bootstrap versions $F^\star_{nj}$, for $j = 1,2,\ldots,J$. Consequently, $F^\star_{n0}$ is defined similar to (4), and for $k = 1,2$, bootstrap versions $S^\star_{nk}$ are defined similar to (1) and (2), with $\widehat{f}^\star_{nj}$ being the left-hand slope of the least concave majorant of $F^\star_{nj}$.

3.2 Monotone regression function

For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, we have observations Y_{ij}, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_j$, satisfying

$$Y_{ij} = f_j(x_{ij}) + \epsilon_{ij}, \tag{36}$$

where $x_{ij} = i/n_j$ and $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{ij}) = 0$. The ϵ_{ij}'s are independent and for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, the variables ϵ_{ij}, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_j$, have the same distribution with a finite variance $\tau_j^2 > 0$. In this case, $L_j(t) = t\tau_j^2$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ (see also Theorem 5 in [9]) and the estimator for F_j is

$$F_{nj}(t) = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} Y_{ij} \mathbb{1}\{x_{ij} \le t\} = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i \le n_j t} Y_{ij}. \tag{37}$$

To define the bootstrap version of the test statistic, we first define $\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij} = Y_{ij} - \widetilde{f}_n(x_{ij})$ and

$$\widetilde{\epsilon}_{ij} = \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij} - \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \widehat{\epsilon}_{ij},$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_j$. Then, conditionally on the original observations Y_{ij}, we define independent random variables $\epsilon^\star_{ij}$ as follows. For $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ fixed, each random variable $\epsilon^\star_{ij}$ is uniformly distributed on $\{\widetilde{\epsilon}_{mj},\ m = 1, 2, \dots, n_j\}$. Finally we set

$$Y^\star_{ij} = \widetilde{f}_n(x_{ij}) + \epsilon^\star_{ij},$$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_j$. For $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, we define bootstrap versions $F^\star_{nj}$ in the same manner as F_{nj} in (37) and (4), just by replacing Y_{ij} by $Y^\star_{ij}$.

Theorem 3 *Suppose* $\max_{1 \le j \le J} \mathbb{E}|\epsilon_{ij}|^q < \infty$, *for some* $q > 6$, *and that (A1) and (A4) hold with* $L_j(t) = t\tau_j^2$. *Let* $\widetilde{f}_n$ *be an estimator that satisfies (*$\text{A}^\star$*) with* $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$, *then for* $k = 1, 2$, *the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level* α.

Note that the theorem holds for any estimator satisfying ($\text{A}^\star$), in particular for the estimator $\widetilde{f}_n$ proposed in Section 3.1, with F_{n0} defined through (37) and (4). Also note that, although it is tempting to consider the pooled estimator $\widetilde{f}_n = \widehat{f}_{n0}$, since it does not depend on any tuning parameter, this estimator does not satisfy ($\text{A}^\star$). We conjecture that with this choice of $\widetilde{f}_n$, the bootstrap calibration does not work and encounters similar difficulties as in [26, 38]. This estimator was used in [39], but no theoretical result was provided for the proposed two-sample test for monotone fractile regression functions, and we suspect that the proposed bootstrap does not always work and that a smoothed bootstrap is needed.

3.3 Monotone density

For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, we have independent observations X_{ij}, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n_j$, with density f_j. The J samples are assumed to be independent. The estimator for F_j in this case is the empirical distribution function

$$F_{nj}(t) = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \mathbb{1}\{X_{ij} \le t\}. \tag{38}$$

Let $\widetilde{f}_n$ be an estimator for $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. One possibility is the kernel density estimator from Section 3.1. Another possibility is to use the least concave majorant $\widehat{F}_{n0}$ of F_{n0} instead of F_{n0}. It follows that for $l = 0, 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\widehat{f}_n^{(l)}(t) - \widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t)\right| &= \left|\frac{1}{h_n^{2+l}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\widehat{F}_{n0}(x) - F_{n0}(x))K^{(l+1)}\left(\frac{t-x}{h_n}\right)\mathrm{d}x\right| \\ &= \left|\frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(\widehat{F}_{n0}(t-uh_n) - F_{n0}(t-uh_n))K^{(l+1)}(u)\,\mathrm{d}u\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}}\sup_{s\in[0,1]}|\widehat{F}_{n0}(s) - F_{n0}(s)|\mathrm{TV}(K^{(l+1)}) \\ &= o(n^{-2/3}\log n)h^{-(l+1)}, \quad \text{a.s.}, \end{aligned}$$

according to [23], where $\mathrm{TV}(K^{(l+1)}) < \infty$ denotes the total variation of $K^{(l+1)}$. This implies that if $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfies the properties of Lemma 5, then also does $\widehat{f}_n$. To define the bootstrap versions of F_{nj}, conditionally on the original observations X_{ij}, we define independent random variables $X^\star_{ij}$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_j$, with the same density $\widetilde{f}_n$. Then we define $F^\star_{nj}$ in the same manner as F_{nj}, just replacing X_{ij} by $X^\star_{ij}$ in (38).

Theorem 4 *Suppose that (A1) and (A4) hold with $L'_j = f_j$ and that $\inf_{t\in[0,1]} f_j(t) > 0$ for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. Let $\widetilde{f}_n$ be an estimator that satisfies (A*) with $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$, then for $k = 1, 2$, the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level α.*

3.4 Random censorship with monotone hazard

For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, we have right-censored observations (X_{ij}, Δ_{ij}), for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_j$, where $X_{ij} = \min(T_{ij}, Y_{ij})$ and $\Delta_{ij} = \mathbb{1}\{T_{ij} \leq Y_{ij}\}$. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, the failure times T_{ij} are assumed to be nonnegative independent with density g_j and to be independent of the i.i.d. censoring times Y_{ij} that have distribution function H_j. The J samples are assumed to be independent. The parameters of interest are the failure rates $f_j = g_j/(1 - G_j)$ on $[0, 1]$, where

$$G_j(t) = \int_0^t g_j(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 1 - \exp\left(-F_j(x)\right).$$

The estimator for the cumulative hazard F_j is defined via the Nelson-Aalen estimator N_{nj} as follows: let $t_{1j} < \cdots < t_{mj}$ denote the ordered distinct uncensored failure times in the jth sample and n_{kj} the number of $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n_j\}$ with $X_{ij} \geq t_{kj}$, then N_{nj} is constant on $[t_{ij}, t_{i+1,j})$ with

$$N_{nj}(t_{ij}) = \sum_{k\leq i}\frac{1}{n_{kj}}, \tag{39}$$

and $N_{nj}(t) = 0$ for all $t < t_{1j}$ and $N_{nj}(t) = N_{nj}(t_{mj})$ for all $t \geq t_{mj}$. The estimator F_{nj} is the restriction of N_{nj} to $[0, 1]$. Finally, as an estimator for the distribution function H_j, we take the Kaplan-Meier estimator H_{nj} based on the jth sample. Let $\widetilde{f}_n$ be an estimator for $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. To define a bootstrap version of F_{nj}, conditionally on the original observations, we first define independent random variables $T^\star_{ij}$ and $Y^\star_{ij}$, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ and $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_j$, where $T^\star_{ij}$ has failure rate $\widetilde{f}_n$ and $Y^\star_{ij}$ has distribution function H_{nj}. Then we set

$$X^\star_{ij} = \min(T^\star_{ij}, Y^\star_{ij}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^\star_{ij} = \mathbb{1}\left\{T^\star_{ij} \leq Y^\star_{ij}\right\}.$$

Finally, we define $F^\star_{nj}$ in the same manner as F_{nj}, just replacing the (X_{ij}, Δ_{ij})'s by the $(X^\star_{ij}, \Delta^\star_{ij})$'s in the definition.

Theorem 5 *Suppose that (A1) and (A4) hold with $L'_j = f_j/((1-G_j)(1-H_j))$ and that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, $\inf_{t\in[0,1]} f_j(t) > 0$, $G_j(1) < 1$, $\lim_{t\uparrow 1} H_j(t) < 1$, and H_j has a bounded continuous first derivative on $(0,1)$. Let $\widetilde{f}_n$ be an estimator that satisfies ($A^\star$) with $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$, then for $k = 1$, the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level α.*

If, in addition, we assume that the censoring variables all have the same distribution function H, then, instead of generating $Y^\star_{ij}$ from distribution function H_{nj} as above, one should merely generate, the bootstrap censoring times $Y^\star_{ij}$ as an n-sample of independent random variables with common distribution function H_n, the Kaplan-Meier estimator of H based on all n observations. With this construction of the bootstrap censoring variables we obtain a similar result.

Theorem 6 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 5 with $H = H_1 = \cdots = H_J$, for $k = 1, 2$, the test with critical region (32) has asymptotic level α.*

4 Appendix

4.1 Proof of the lemmas in Section 2

Proof of Lemma 1: Because $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$ and $\sum_j c_j = 1$, according to (4), we can write

$$M_{n0} = F_{n0} - F_0 = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j (F_{nj} - F_j) = \sum_{j=1}^J c_j M_{nj}.$$

Since $c_j = n_j/n$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$, this means that

$$M_{n0}(t) - n^{-1/2} B_{n0} \circ L_0(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^J n_j \left(M_{nj}(t) - n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj} \circ L_j(t) \right).$$

We now have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left\{ n^{1-1/q} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| M_{n0}(t) - n^{-1/2} B_{n0} \circ L_0(t) \right| > x \right\} \\ &\le \mathbb{P}\left\{ n^{-1/q} \sum_{j=1}^J n_j \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| M_{nj}(u) - n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj} \circ L_j(u) \right| > x \right\} \qquad (40) \\ &\le \sum_{j=1}^J \mathbb{P}\left\{ n_j^{1-1/q} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| M_{nj}(u) - n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj} \circ L_j(u) \right| > \frac{x}{J} c_j^{-1/q} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (A3) to each summand yields (12) for all $0 < x \le nJ(\min c_j)^{1+1/q}$. Possibly enlarging C, we obtain the result for all $x \in (0, n]$. □

To prove Lemma 2 for all $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ and $S = E, B, W$, we first need to establish two results on the tail probabilities of $\widehat{U}^S_{nj}$, that are an extension of Lemmas 3 and 4 in [9]. For $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, let g_j denote the inverse of f_j, defined for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g_j(a) = \sup\{t \in [0,1],\ f_j(t) \geq a\}, \tag{41}$$

with the convention that the supremum of an empty set is 0.

Lemma 7 *Assume (A1), (A2) and suppose $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Then, there exists $C > 0$, such that for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, $S = E, B, W$, $x > 0$, and $a \notin [f_j(1), f_j(0)]$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \leq \frac{C}{nx(f_j \circ g_j(a) - a)^2}.$$

Proof: We follow the line of reasoning used in the proof of Lemma 3 in [9]. It suffices to prove the result for $x \in (0,1]$, since the considered probability vanishes for $x \geq 1$. Moreover, for simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case $a > f_j(0)$, so that $g_j(a) = 0$. The case $a < f_j(1)$ can be treated likewise. By definition of $\widehat{U}^S_{nj}$ we have:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - g_j(a)| > x}\left\{F^S_{nj}(u) - au\right\} \geq F^S_{nj}(g_j(a)) - ag_j(a)\right). \tag{42}$$

Since f_j is decreasing according to (A1), we have $F_j(u) - F_j(0) \leq uf_j(0)$, for all $u \in [0,1]$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u > x}\left\{M^S_{nj}(u) - M^S_{nj}(0) - u(a - f_j(0))\right\} \geq 0\right),$$

where

$$M^S_{nj}(u) = F^S_{nj}(u) - F_j(u). \tag{43}$$

It then follows from Markov's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in [x2^{k-1}, x2^k]}\left\{M^S_{nj}(u) - M^S_{nj}(0)\right\} \geq x2^{k-1}(a - f_j(0))\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{u \in [x2^{k-1}, x2^k]}\left(M^S_{nj}(u) - M^S_{nj}(0)\right)^2\right]}{x^2 2^{2k-2}(a - f_j(0))^2}.\end{aligned}$$

If we are able to show that there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that for all $x \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{x/2 \leq u \leq x}\left(M^S_{nj}(u) - M^S_{nj}(0)\right)^2\right] \leq \frac{Cx}{n}, \tag{44}$$

then we would obtain the required result since in that case,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \leq \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{Cx2^k}{nx^2 2^{2k-2}(a - f_j(0))^2} \leq \frac{K}{nx(a - f_j(0))^2}.$$

It thus remains to prove (44) for $S = E, B, W$. First consider $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. In the case $S = E$, inequality (44) follows from condition (A2). In the case $S = W$, since L_j is increasing, the process $M_{nj}^W(u) = n_j^{-1/2} W_{nj}(L_j(u))$ is a mean zero martingale and it follows from Doob's inequality, that for all $x \geq 0$:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\leq u\leq 1\wedge x}\left(M_{nj}^W(u) - M_{nj}^W(0)\right)^2\right] \leq 4\mathbb{E}\left[\left(M_{nj}^W(1\wedge x) - M_{nj}^W(0)\right)^2\right] \leq \frac{Cx}{n},$$

because $M_{nj}^W(1\wedge x) - M_{nj}^W(0)$ has a normal distribution with mean zero and variance $n_j^{-1}(L_j(1\wedge x) - L_j(0))$, which is bounded by $n_j^{-1}(\sup_t |L_j'(t)|)x$. This yields (44) for $S = W$. In the case $S = B$, we write

$$M_{nj}^B(t) - M_{nj}^B(u) = M_{nj}^W(t) - M_{nj}^W(u) - n_j^{-1/2}\xi_{nj}(L_j(t) - L_j(u)).$$

Next, inequality (9) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{0\leq u\leq 1\wedge x}\left(M_{nj}^B(u) - M_{nj}^B(0)\right)^2\right] &\leq \frac{2Cx}{n} + \frac{2\mathbb{E}[\xi_{nj}^2]}{n_j}\sup_{0\leq u\leq 1\wedge x}(L_j(u) - L_j(0))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2Cx}{n} + \frac{2}{n_j}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]}|L_j'(t)|\right)^2 (1\wedge x)^2.\end{aligned}$$

For $x \geq 0$, we have$(1\wedge x)^2 \leq x$, whence (44) holds for $S = B$.

Finally, consider the case $j = 0$ and $S = E, B, W$. From (19), (43), and (9), we find:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{x/2\leq u\leq x}\left(M_{n0}^S(u) - M_{n0}^S(0)\right)^2\right] \leq J\sum_{j=1}^J c_j^2 \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{x/2\leq u\leq x}\left(M_{nj}^S(u) - M_{nj}^S(0)\right)^2\right], \tag{45}$$

for all $x \geq 0$. Since (44) holds for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ and $S = E, B, W$, it also holds for $j = 0$ and $S = E, B, W$. □

Lemma 8 *Assume (A1), (A3) and suppose $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Then, there exist $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for every $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, $x > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}_{nj}^S(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \leq 2\exp(-cnx^3), \tag{46}$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}_{nj}^S(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \leq C(nx^3)^{1-q}, \tag{47}$$

for $S = E, B, W$.

Proof: We follow the line of reasoning used in the proof of Lemma 4 in [9] and assume $x \in (0, 1]$. Let β satisfy $0 < \beta < \inf_t |f_j'(t)|/2$, for every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, which is possible according to (A1). From Taylor's expansion, $F_j(u) - F_j(g_j(a)) \leq (u - g_j(a))a - \beta(u - g_j(a))^2$, for all $u \in [0, 1]$, so (42) yields:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}_{nj}^S(a) - g_j(a)| > x\right) \\ &\quad\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u-g_j(a)|>x}\left\{M_{nj}^S(u) - M_{nj}^S(g_j(a)) - \beta(u - g_j(a))^2\right\} \geq 0\right).\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

To cover all cases $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ simultaneously, write

$$n_0 = n \quad \text{and define} \quad \xi^S_{nj}(t) = \begin{cases} \xi_{n0}(t) & , j = 0 \\ \xi_{nj} t & , j = 1, 2, \ldots, J. \end{cases} \tag{49}$$

where ξ_{n0} is defined in (17). Note that $\xi^W_{nj}(t) \equiv 0$, for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. For $S = B, W$, we have $M^S_{nj}(u) = M^W_{nj}(u) - n_j^{-1/2} \xi^S_{nj}(L_j(u))$, so that in both cases,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x \right) \\ &\quad \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - g_j(a)| > x} \left\{ M^W_{nj}(u) - M^W_{nj}(g_j(a)) - \frac{\beta}{2}(u - g_j(a))^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right) \\ &\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - g_j(a)| > x} \left\{ \xi^S_{nj}(L_j(g_j(a))) - \xi^S_{nj}(L_j(u)) - \frac{\beta n_j^{1/2}}{2}(u - g_j(a))^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Let W be a standard two-sided Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}$. Setting $v = L_j(u) - L_j(g_j(a))$, $k_0 \leq \inf_t |L'_j(t)|$ and $k_1 \geq \sup_t |L'_j(t)|^2$, one can derive from the assumptions on L_j and scaling properties of W that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - g_j(a)| > x} \left\{ M^W_{nj}(u) - M^W_{nj}(g_j(a)) - \frac{\beta}{2}(u - g_j(a))^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right) \\ &\quad \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|v| > k_0 x} \left\{ n_j^{-1/2} W(v) - \frac{\beta v^2}{2k_1} \right\} \geq 0 \right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|v| > k_0 x} \left\{ \frac{W(v)}{|v|} \right\} \geq n_j^{1/2} \frac{\beta k_0 x}{2k_1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The process $\{uW(1/u),\ u > 0\}$ is distributed like $\{W(u),\ u > 0\}$, and the distribution of W is symmetric about zero. By Proposition 1.8 on page 52 in [37], we conclude that there exists $C, K_1 > 0$ depending only on L_j, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - g_j(a)| > x} \left\{ M^W_{nj}(u) - M^W_{nj}(g_j(a)) - \frac{\beta}{2}(u - g_j(a))^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right) \\ &\quad \leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{v > k_0 x} \left\{ \frac{W(v)}{v} \right\} \geq n_j^{1/2} \frac{\beta k_0 x}{2k_1} \right) \leq 2\exp(-K_1 n \beta^2 x^3). \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

From (50), there thus exists $K_2 > 0$, such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x \right) \leq 2\exp\left(-K_1 n \beta^2 x^3 \right) + C(j)\mathbb{P}(|\xi| > K_2 \beta n^{1/2} x),$$

where ξ is a standard Gaussian variable, $C(j) = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ and $C(0) = J$. Since $x \in (0, 1]$, the latter probability is bounded from above by $\exp\left(-K_1 n \beta^2 x^3 \right)$, provided K_1 is small enough. Therefore, there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x \right) \leq 3\exp\left(-K_1 n \beta^2 x^3 \right) \leq C(nx^3)^{1-q},$$

which proves the lemma for the cases $S = B, W$. In the case $S = E$, (48) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{U}^E_{nj}(a) - g_j(a)| > x \right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u - g_j(a)| > x} \left\{ M^B_{nj}(u) - M^B_{nj}(g_j(a)) - \frac{\beta}{2}(u - g_j(a))^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |M^E_{nj}(u) - M^B_{nj}(u)| \geq \frac{\beta x^2}{4} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we recall that $M^B_{nj}(u) = n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj}(L_j(u))$. From what precedes, the first probability on the right hand side is bounded from above by $C(nx^3)^{1-q}$ for some $C > 0$. Note that $x \in (0, 1]$ and we can assume $\beta < 1$. In the cases $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, it follows from assumption (A3) that there is $K_4 > 0$ with

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{u\in[0,1]} |M^E_{nj}(u) - M^B_{nj}(u)| \geq \frac{\beta x^2}{4}\right) \leq K_4 \beta^{-q} x^{-2q} n^{1-q} \leq K_4 \beta^{-q} (nx^3)^{1-q}.$$

From Lemma 1, this inequality still holds with $j = 0$, which completes the proof. □

Proof of Lemma 2: We have

$$\int_0^1 (\widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t) - \widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t))_+ \,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{a \leq \widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t) - \widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t)} \,\mathrm{d}a \,\mathrm{d}t.$$

For all $t \in (0, 1]$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $\widehat{U}^S_{ni}(a) \geq t$ if and only if $\widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t) \geq a$, so the change of variable $b = a + \widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 (\widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t) - \widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t))_+ \,\mathrm{d}t &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t) < b \leq \widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t)} \,\mathrm{d}t \,\mathrm{d}b \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b) < t \leq \widehat{U}^S_{ni}(b)} \,\mathrm{d}t \,\mathrm{d}b \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\widehat{U}^S_{ni}(b) - \widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b))_+ \,\mathrm{d}b,\end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\int_0^1 |\widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t) - \widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t)| \,\mathrm{d}t = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{U}^S_{ni}(b) - \widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b)| \,\mathrm{d}b.$$

From Fubini's theorem and Lemmas 7 and 8, there exists $K > 0$, such that for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ and $S = E, B, W$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \int_{f_j(0)}^\infty |\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b) - g_j(b)| \,\mathrm{d}b &= \int_0^\infty \int_{f_j(0)}^\infty \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b) - g_j(b)| > x) \,\mathrm{d}b \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq K \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty 1 \wedge \frac{1}{nx^3} \wedge \frac{1}{nxb^2} \,\mathrm{d}b \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq K \int_0^{n^{-1/3}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nx}} + \int_{1/\sqrt{nx}}^\infty \frac{1}{nxb^2} \,\mathrm{d}b\right) \mathrm{d}x \\ &\quad + K \int_{n^{-1/3}}^\infty \left(\frac{1}{nx^2} + \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{nxb^2} \,\mathrm{d}b\right) \mathrm{d}x \\ &= 6Kn^{-2/3}.\end{aligned}$$

The integral $\int_{-\infty}^{f_j(1)} |\widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b) - g_j(b)| \,\mathrm{d}b$ can be treated likewise, so we obtain

$$\int_0^1 |\widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t) - \widehat{f}^S_{ni}(t)| \,\mathrm{d}t = \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}^S_{ni}(b) - \widehat{U}^S_{nj}(b)| \,\mathrm{d}b + O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-2/3}).$$

$\square$

In order to prove Lemma 3, the line of reasoning is similar to that in [13], except that in the current situation we work in a more general model. The key result that we need is an extended version of Lemma 3.4 in [13], provided by the following lemma.

Lemma 9 *Assume (A1), (A3), (A4) and suppose* $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. *For* $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ *and* $S = E, B, W$ *let*

$$\widehat{V}_{nj}^S(a) = n_j^{1/3}\left(\widehat{U}_{nj}^S(a) - g_j(a)\right), \tag{52}$$

and

$$J_{nj} = \left[f_j(1) + n_j^{-1/3}\log n_j, f_j(0) - n_j^{-1/3}\log n_j\right],$$

where $n_0 = n$. *Then there exists a constant* $\beta_j > 0$, *independent of* $a \in J_{nj}$, *such that for* $S = B, W$ *and for all* $h \in (0,1)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat{V}_{nj}^S \text{ jumps in } \left(a - hn_j^{-1/3}, a + hn_j^{-1/3}\right)\right\} \leq \beta_j \delta_{n,h} + o(\delta_{n,h})$$

as $\delta_{n,h} \downarrow 0$, *where* $\delta_{n,h} = h \vee (n^{-\alpha/3}(\log n)^{\alpha+1})$, *where* $\alpha \in (3/4, 1]$ *is taken from (A4).*

Proof: We follow the line of reasoning used in the proof of Lemma 3.4 in [13]. In order to transform the process $t \mapsto W_{nj} \circ L_j(g_j(a) + n_j^{-1/3}t)$ into the process $t \mapsto W_{nj}(L_j(g_j(a)) + n_j^{-1/3}t)$, we define for $|c| \leq 1$,

$$\widehat{L}_j^S(a,c) = n_j^{1/3}\left\{L_j\big(\widehat{U}_{nj}^S(a + n_j^{-1/3}c)\big) - L_j\big(g_j(a)\big)\right\}.$$

Then $\widehat{V}_{nj}^S$ has a jump in $(a - hn_j^{-1/3}, a + hn_j^{-1/3})$ if and only if $c \mapsto \widehat{L}_j^S(a,c)$ has a jump in $(-h, h)$. Then in the case $S = W$ we have

$$\widehat{L}_j^W(a,c) = \underset{y \in I_{nj}(a)}{\operatorname{argmax}}\left\{W_{g_j(a),j}(y) - p_{nj}(c,y)\right\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{nj}(a) &= \left[n_j^{1/3}(L_j(0) - L_j(g_j(a))),\, n_j^{1/3}(L_j(1) - L_j(g_j(a)))\right], \\ W_{tj}(y) &= n_j^{1/6}\left\{W_{nj}\big(L_j(t) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big) - W_{nj}\big(L_j(t)\big)\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

with W_{nj}, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, being independent Brownian motions from (5) and W_{n0} is the Brownian motion defined by (16), and where

$$\begin{aligned} p_{nj}(c,y) = &-n_j^{2/3}\left\{(F_j \circ H_j)\left(L_j(g_j(a)) + n_j^{-1/3}y\right) - F_j\left(g_j(a)\right)\right\} \\ &+ n_j^{2/3}(a + n_j^{-1/3}c)\left\{H_j\left(L_j(g_j(a)) + n_j^{-1/3}y\right) - g_j(a)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $H_j = L_j^{-1}$. To deal with the case $S = B$ for all $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, J$ simultaneously, write $B_{nj}(t) = W_{nj}(t) - \xi_{nj}^B(t)$, where ξ_{nj}^B is defined in (49), and write $t_j = g_j(a)$. Then,

$$\widehat{L}_j^B(a,c) = \underset{y \in I_{nj}(a)}{\operatorname{argmax}}\left\{B_{t_j,j}(y) - p_{nj}(c,y)\right\},$$

where

$$B_{t_j,j}(y) = W_{t_j,j}(y) - n_j^{1/6}\left\{\xi_{nj}^B\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big) - \xi_{nj}^B\big(L_j(t_j)\big)\right\}.$$

Now, to deal simultaneously with the cases $S = B, W$, define $\widehat{\psi}_{nj}^W(c) = \widehat{L}_j^W(a,c)$ and

$$\widehat{\psi}_{nj}^B(c) = \underset{y \in I_{nj}(a)}{\operatorname{argmax}}\left\{B_{t_j,j}(y) - p_{nj}\big(c - n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^B}'(L_j(t_j)), y\big)\right\},$$

so hat $\widehat{L}_j^S(a,c) = \widehat{\psi}_{nj}^S(c + n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j)))$, for $S = B, W$. It follows that

$$\widehat{\psi}_{nj}^S(c) = \underset{y \in I_{nj}(a)}{\operatorname{argmax}}\left\{W_{t_j,j}(y) - q_{nj}^S(c,y)\right\},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} q_{nj}^S(c,y) = n_j^{1/6}&\left\{\xi_{nj}^S\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big) - \xi_{nj}^S\big(L_j(t_j)\big)\right\} \\ &+ p_{nj}\big(c - n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j)), y\big). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that the process $\widehat{V}_{nj}^S$ jumps in the interval $(a - hn_j^{-1/3}, a + hn_j^{-1/3})$. Then $\widehat{\psi}_{nj}^S$ has a jump at some

$$c^* \in \left(-h + n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j)), h + n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))\right).$$

This means that if we drop the function $y \mapsto q_{nj}^S(c^*, y) + \beta$ for varying $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ onto the process $W_{t_j,j}$, it first touches $W_{t_j,j}$ simultaneously in two points, say (y_i^S, w_i^S), for $i = 1, 2$, where $w_i^S = W_{t_j,j}(y_i^S) = q_{nj}^S(c^*, y_i^S) + \beta^S$, for some $\beta^S \in \mathbb{R}$. Define the event $A_{nj}^S = \{|\widehat{L}_j^S(a,c)| \leq \log n_j$, for all $|c| \leq 1\}$. By Lemma 8 it follows that $\mathbb{P}((A_{nj}^S)^c) = o(\delta_{n,h})$. Furthermore, define $A_n' = \{|\xi_{nj}| \leq n_j^{1/6}$, for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J\}$. Then, $\mathbb{P}((A_n')^c) = o(\delta_{n,h})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{V}_{nj}^S \text{ jumps in } (a - hn_j^{1/3}, a + hn_j^{1/3})\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{V}_{nj}^S \text{ jumps in } (a - hn_j^{1/3}, a + hn_j^{1/3}), A_{nj}^S \cap A_n'\right) + o(\delta_{n,h}), \end{aligned}$$

and we can restrict ourselves to the event $A_{nj}^S \cap A_n'$. On this event, we have $|y_1^S - y_2^S| \leq 2\log n_j$.

Next, we show that for each y_i^S, $i = 1, 2$, we can construct a parabola that lies above $q_{nj}^S(c^*, y) + \beta^S$ for all $|y| \leq \log n_j$ and that touches $W_{t_j,j}(y)$ at (y_i^S, w_i^S). To this end first consider the derivatives of $p_{nj}(c, y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}p_{nj}(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y} &= -n_j^{1/3}\big(F_j \circ H_j\big)'\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big) + n_j^{1/3}(a + n_j^{-1/3}c)H_j'\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big), \\ \frac{\mathrm{d}^2p_{nj}(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} &= -\big(F_j \circ H_j\big)''\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big) + (a + n_j^{-1/3}c)H_j''\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big). \end{aligned}$$

With assumption (A4), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}^2p_{nj}(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} &= \frac{\mathrm{d}^2p_{nj}(c,0)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} + (1 + cn^{-1/3})O((n^{-1/3}y)^s) \\ &= \frac{|f_j'(t_j)|}{L_j'(t_j)^2} + (1 + cn^{-1/3})O((n^{-1/3}y)^s) + O(cn^{-1/3}). \end{aligned}$$

The second derivative of $q_{nj}^S(c,y)$ is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 q_{nj}^S(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} = n_j^{-1/2} {\xi_{nj}^S}''\big(L_j(t_j) + n_j^{-1/3}y\big) + \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 p_{nj}\big(c - n_j^{-1/6} L_j'(t_j) {\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j)), y\big)}{\mathrm{d}y^2}.$$

Using that $p_{nj}(c+d,y) = p_{nj}(c,y) + d n_j^{1/3}\{H_j(L_j(t_j)+n_j^{-1/3}y) - t_j\}$, and the fact that on the event $A_{nj}^S \cap A_n'$, one has $n_j^{-1/2}|{\xi_{nj}^S}''\big(L_j(t_j)+n_j^{-1/3}y\big)| \leq K_1 n^{-1/3}$, for some $K_1 > 0$ only depending on the c_j's and L_j's, we conclude that on $A_{nj}^S \cap A_n'$,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 q_{nj}^S(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} = \frac{|f_j'(t_j)|}{L_j'(t_j)^2}\left(1 + O(n^{-1/3}\log n)^s\right),$$

where the approximation is uniform in $|y| \leq \log n_j$ and $|c| \leq 1$. Therefore, there exists a $K_2 > 0$ that only depends on f_j, the c_j's and L_j's, such that on $A_{nj}^S \cap A_n'$,

$$0 < \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 q_{nj}^S(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} \leq \frac{|f_j'(t_j)|}{L_j'(t_j)^2}\left\{1 + K_2(n^{-1/3}\log n)^s\right\},$$

for all $|y| \leq \log n_j$ and $|c| \leq 1$. Choose $M > K_2$ and define the parabola

$$\pi_{nj}(c,y) = \frac{c}{L_j'(t_j)}y + \alpha_{nj}y^2,$$

where

$$\alpha_{nj} = \frac{|f_j'(t_j)|}{2L_j'(t_j)^2}\left\{1 + M(n^{-1/3}\log n)^s\right\}. \tag{54}$$

Then it follows that for all $|y| \leq \log n_j$, $|c| \leq 1$, and $b \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 \pi_{nj}(b,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2} > \frac{\mathrm{d}^2 q_{nj}^S(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y^2}.$$

Now, for each $i = 1,2$, choose b_i such that

$$\frac{b_i}{L_j'(t_j)} + 2\alpha_{nj}y_i = \frac{\mathrm{d}q_{nj}^S(c^*,y_i)}{\mathrm{d}y},$$

so that the functions $\pi_{nj}(b_i,y)$ and $q_{nj}^S(c^*,y)$ have the same tangent at y_i. If we also take $\gamma_i = q_{nj}^S(c^*,y_i) - \pi_{nj}(b_i,y_i)$, then it follows that the parabola $\pi_{nj}(b_i,y)+\gamma_i$ lies above $q_{nj}^S(c^*,y)$ and touches $q_{nj}^S(c^*,y)$ at y_i in such a way that they have the same tangent. This implies that if we drop $\pi_{nj}(b_i,y)+\gamma$, for varying $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ onto the process $W_{t_j,j}$, it first touches $W_{t_j,j}$ at y_i. Hence, if we define

$$\widehat{V}_{nj}^{\pi}(c) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{y \in I_{nj}(a)} \left\{W_{t_j,j}(y) - \pi_{nj}(c,y)\right\},$$

then from the above construction, it follows that the process $\widehat{V}_{nj}^{\pi}$ has a jump in the interval $[b_1,b_2]$ of maximal size $|y_1 - y_2| \leq 2\log n_j$. Because

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{d}q_{nj}^S(c,y)}{\mathrm{d}y} &= n_j^{-1/6}{\xi_{nj}^S}'\bigl(L_j(t_j)+n_j^{-1/3}y\bigr)+\frac{\mathrm{d}p_{nj}\bigl(c-n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j)),y\bigr)}{\mathrm{d}y}\\
&=\frac{c}{L_j'(t_j)}+\frac{|f_j'(t_j)|}{L_j'(t_j)^2}y+O(n^{-1/3}y)+O((n^{-1/3}y)^\alpha),
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\frac{\mathrm{d}\pi_{nj}(b,y)}{\mathrm{d}y}=\frac{b}{L_j'(t_j)}+2\alpha_{nj}y=\frac{b}{L_j'(t_j)}+\frac{|f_j'(t_j)|}{L_j'(t_j)^2}y+y\,O((n^{-1/3}\log n)^\alpha),
$$

it follows from $\mathrm{d}q_{nj}^S(c^*,y_i)/\,\mathrm{d}y=\mathrm{d}\pi_{nj}(b_i,y_i)/\,\mathrm{d}y$, that there exists a constant $K_3>0$, such that $|b_i-c^*|\le K_3|y_i+1|(n^{-1/3}\log n)^\alpha$, for $i=1,2$. Therefore,

$$
|b_i-c^*|\le K_4n^{-\alpha/3}(\log n)^{\alpha+1}.
$$

Because

$$
c^*\in(-h+n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j)),h+n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))),
$$

this means that

$$
\begin{aligned}
[b_1,b_2]\subset\Bigl(&-h+n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))-K_4n_j^{-\alpha/3}(\log n_j)^{\alpha+1},\\
&h+n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))+K_4n_j^{-\alpha/3}(\log n_j)^{\alpha+1}\Bigr).
\end{aligned}
$$

On the event $A_{nj}^S\cap A_n'$, it follows that there exists a constant $K_5>0$ such that $[b_1,b_2]$ is contained in

$$
\mathcal{I}_{nj}'=\left(n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))-K_5\delta_{n,h},n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))+K_5\delta_{n,h}\right),
$$

where $\delta_{n,h}=h\vee(n^{-\alpha/3}(\log n)^{\alpha+1})$, so that the process $\widehat V_{nj}^\pi$ jumps in the interval $\mathcal{I}_{nj}'$. Hence

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat V_{nj}^S\text{ jumps in }(a-hn_j^{1/3},a+hn_j^{1/3})\right)\le\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat V_{nj}^\pi\text{ jumps in }\mathcal{I}_{nj}'\right)+o(\delta_{n,h}).
$$

In the case $S=W$, we have

$$
\mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat V_{nj}^\pi\text{ jumps in }\mathcal{I}_{nj}'\right\}=\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat V_{nj}^\pi\text{ jumps in }\ (K_5\delta_{n,h},K_5\delta_{n,h})\right).
$$

In the case $S=B$, because ξ_{nj}^S is independent of the process $W_{t_j,j}$,

$$
\mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat V_{nj}^\pi\text{ jumps in }\mathcal{I}_{nj}'\right\}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}\left\{\widehat V_{nj}^\pi\text{ jumps in }\ (a-K_5\delta_{n,h},a+K_5\delta_{n,h})\right\}h_{nj}(a)\,\mathrm{d}a,
$$

where h_{nj} denotes the density of $n_j^{-1/6}L_j'(t_j){\xi_{nj}^S}'(L_j(t_j))$. Moreover, in both cases $S=W,B$, the process $W_{t_j,j}$ is distributed like Brownian motion W, so the variable $\widehat V_{nj}^\pi(c)$ is distributed as

$$
\mathop{\mathrm{argmax}}_{y\in I_{nj}(a)}\left\{W(y)-\frac{c}{L_j'(t_j)}y-\alpha_{nj}y^2\right\},
$$

where α_{nj} and $I_{nj}(a)$ are defined in (54) and (53). Since $a \in J_{nj}$ and the L_j's have a bounded first derivative, there exists K_6 such that this random variable only differs from

$$\widetilde{V}_{nj}(c) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{y\in\mathbb{R}} \left\{ W(y) - \alpha_{nj}\left(y + \frac{c}{2\alpha_{nj}L_j'(t_j)} \right)^2 \right\},$$

if $|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(c)| > K_6 \log n_j$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left\{ \widehat{V}_{nj}^{\pi} \text{ jumps in } (a - K_5\delta_{n,h}, a + K_5\delta_{n,h}) \right\} \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{ \widetilde{V}_{nj} \text{ jumps in } (a - K_5\delta_{n,h}, a + K_5\delta_{n,h}) \right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{c\in\mathcal{I}_{nj}} |\widetilde{V}_{nj}(c)| > \log n_j \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 3.3(iii) in [13] the first probability is of the order $\delta_{n,h}$, uniformly in a. Finally, from the monotonicity of $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(c)$ together with property (3.16) and Lemma 3.3(ii) in [13], it follows that the second probability is of smaller order. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 9 enables us the make the transition from the empirical inverse process to the Brownian bridge process and establish Lemma 3. In the sequel, for $x, t \in \mathbb{R}$ and a function $G : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we use the notation $G(t, x] = G(x) - G(t)$.

Proof of Lemma 3: The proof is along the lines of the proof of Corollary 3.1 in [13]. For $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, let

$$K_{nj} = \left\{ n_j^{2/3} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| M_{nj}(t) - n_j^{-1/2} B_{nj}(L_j(t)) \right| \leq \delta_{nj} \right\},$$

where $\delta_{nj} = n_j^{-1/3+1/q} \log n$ and $n_0 = n$. By condition (A3) and Lemma 1 it follows that $\mathbb{P}(K_{nj}) \to 1$, as $n_j \to \infty$. Hence, we can restrict ourselves to the event K_{nj}. Also fix $a \in (f_j(1), f_j(0))$ and let

$$A_{nj} = \left\{ |\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a)| \leq n_j^{\gamma}, |\widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| \leq \log n_j \right\}, \qquad \text{where } \frac{1}{6(q-1)} < \gamma < \frac{\alpha}{3} - \frac{1}{6},$$

(such a choice of γ is allowed since $\alpha > 3/4$ and $q > 6$) and write $A'_{nj} = K_{nj} \cap A_{nj}$. Then by Lemma 8 we have

$$\mathbb{P}(K_{nj} \cap A_{nj}^c) \leq K n_j^{-3\gamma(q-1)}.$$

Hence, since $|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| \leq 2n_j^{1/3}$, we have for $a \in (f_j(1), f_j(0))$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| \mathbb{1}_{K_{nj}} \leq \mathbb{E}|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| \mathbb{1}_{A'_{nj}} + 2n_j^{1/3} \cdot K n_j^{-3\gamma(q-1)}.$$

The second term on the right hand side is $o(n_j^{-1/6})$. To bound the first term, write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| \mathbb{1}_{A'_{nj}} &= \int_0^{\epsilon_{nj}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| > x, A'_{nj} \right) \mathrm{d}x \\
&\quad + \int_{\epsilon_{nj}}^{2n_j^{\gamma}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| > x, A'_{nj} \right) \mathrm{d}x \\
&\leq \epsilon_{nj} + \int_{\epsilon_{nj}}^{2n_j^{\gamma}} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{V}_{nj}^E(a) - \widehat{V}_{nj}^B(a)| > x, A'_{nj} \right) \mathrm{d}x,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_{nj} = n_j^{-1/3+\gamma}(\log n_j)^2$. By definition of $\widehat{V}_{nj}^S(a)$ for $S = E, B$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, we have:

$$\widehat{V}_{nj}^S(a) = \underset{g_j(a)+n_j^{-1/3}u\in[0,1]}{\operatorname{argmax}} Z^S_{nj,g_j(a)}(u)$$

where

$$Z^S_{nj,t}(u) = n_j^{2/3}\left\{M^S_{nj}\big(t, t+n_j^{-1/3}u\big] + F_j\big(t, t+n_j^{-1/3}u\big] - f_j(t)n_j^{-1/3}u\right\}. \tag{55}$$

Since $n_j^{2/3}|M^E_{nj}(t) - M^B_{nj}(t)| \le \delta_{nj}$ on the event A'_{nj}, we can only have $|\widehat{V}^E_{nj}(a) - \widehat{V}^B_{nj}(a)| > x$, if

$$|Z^B_{nj,g_j(a)}\left(\widehat{V}^B_{nj}(a)\right) - Z^B_{nj,g_j(a)}(u)| \le 2\delta_{nj},$$

for some $u \in [-n_j^{1/3}g_j(a), n_j^{1/3}(1-g_j(a))]$, such that $|u - \widehat{V}^B_{nj}(a)| > x$. From here on the argument is identical to the one in the proof of Corollary 3.1 in [13], and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|\widehat{V}^E_{nj}(a) - \widehat{V}^B_{nj}(a)|\mathbb{1}_{A'_{nj}} &\le \epsilon_{nj} + \int_{\epsilon_{nj}}^{2n_j^\gamma} \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{V}^E_{nj}(a) - \widehat{V}^B_{nj}(a)| > x, A'_{nj}\right) \mathrm{d}x \\ &\le \epsilon_{nj} + \int_{\epsilon_{nj}}^{2n_j^\gamma} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{V}^B_{nj} \text{ has a jump in } \left[a - \frac{2\delta_{nj}}{n_j^{1/3}x}, a + \frac{2\delta_{nj}}{n_j^{1/3}x}\right]\right) \mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 9 the right hand side is bounded by

$$\epsilon_{nj} + \beta_j(1+o(1))\int_{\epsilon_{nj}}^{2n_j^\gamma}\left(\frac{2n_j^{-1/3+1/q}\log n}{x} \vee \left(n^{-\alpha/3}(\log n)^{\alpha+1}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}x = o\left(n_j^{-1/6}\right),$$

uniformly in $a \in (f_j(1), f_j(0))$, since $q > 6$ and $\gamma < \alpha/3 - 1/6$. The lemma then follows from the Markov inequality. □

We proceed by establishing Lemma 4 to make the transition to Brownian motion. For this we first prove that under $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$, standardized slopes converge in distribution to the slopes of the LCM of the process $W(s) - s^2 + 2xs$. For $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, J$ and $S = E, B, W$, define

$$\widehat{\phi}^S_{nj}(t) = n_j^{1/3}\left\{\widehat{f}^S_{nj}(t) - f_j(t)\right\}. \tag{56}$$

Then $\widehat{\phi}^S_{nj}(t)$ is the slope at $s = 0$ of the LCM of the process $Z^S_{nj,t}(s)$ defined in (55). For $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ and $t \in [0,1]$, define scaling constants

$$A_j(t) = \frac{2^{1/3}}{|f'_j(t)|^{1/3}L'_j(t)^{1/3}} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad B_j(t) = \frac{4^{1/3}L'_j(t)^{1/3}}{|f'_j|^{2/3}} > 0,$$

and

$$I_{nj}(t) = \left\{u : t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)u \in [0,1]\right\}.$$

Lemma 10 *Assume (A2), (A3). Suppose $f_0 = f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$ and for $t \in (0,1)$, let*

$$\Phi^S_{nj,t}(x) = A_j(t)\widehat{\phi}^S_{nj}\big(t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)x\big)$$

where $\widehat{\phi}^S_{nj}$ is defined by (56). Then, for $S = E, B, W$, and $x \in \bigcap_{j=0}^J I_{nj}(t)$ fixed, the vector $(\Phi^S_{n0,t}(x), \Phi^S_{n1,t}(x), \ldots, \Phi^S_{nJ,t}(x))$ converges in distribution to $(\widetilde{\Phi}_{t0}(x), \Phi_1(x), \ldots, \Phi_J(x))$, where

$$\Phi_j(x) = \text{the slope at } s = x \text{ of the LCM of the process } W_j(s) - s^2 + 2xs, \tag{57}$$

where $W_1, W_2, \ldots, W_J$ are independent standard Brownian motions and $\widetilde{\Phi}_{t0}$ is defined similarly with the standard Brownian motion $\widetilde{W}_{t0}$ defined in (14).

Proof. For $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, $t \in (0,1)$ fixed and $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the event

$$\Phi^S_{nj,t}(x) \le a_j \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \widehat{f}^S_{nj}\left(t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)x\right) \le f_j\left(t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)x\right) + n_j^{-1/3}A_j(t)^{-1}a_j,$$

which, according to (22), is equivalent to

$$B_j(t)^{-1}n_j^{1/3}\left\{\widehat{U}^S_{nj}\left(f_j(t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)x) + n_j^{-1/3}A_j(t)^{-1}a_j\right) - t\right\} \le x, \tag{58}$$

where $n_0 = n$. By (21), the left hand side of (58) is the argmax over $u \in I_{nj}(t)$ of the process

$$\begin{aligned} n_j^{2/3}\Big\{ & M^S_{nj}\left(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)u\right] + F_j\left(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)u\right] \\ & - f_j\left(t + n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)x\right)n_j^{-1/3}B_j(t)u\Big\} \\ & - A_j(t)^{-1}B_j(t)a_j u. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

For $t + n_j^{-1/3}s \in [0,1]$, write

$$\begin{aligned} n_j^{2/3}M^S_{nj}\big(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}s\big] &= n_j^{1/6}W_{nj} \circ L_j\big(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}s)\big] \\ &\quad + n_j^{2/3}\left(M^S_{nj} - n_j^{-1/2}B_{nj} \circ L_j\right)\big(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}s\big] \\ &\quad + n_j^{1/6}\xi^S_{nj} \circ L_j\big(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}s\big], \end{aligned}$$

where ξ^S_{nj} and n_0 are defined in (49). According to (A3) and Lemma 1,

$$\sup_{t + n_j^{-1/3}s \in [0,1]} \left| n_j^{2/3}\left(M^S_{nj} - n_j^{-1/2}B_{nj} \circ L_j\right)\big(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}s\big] \right| = n_j^{2/3}O_p\left(n_j^{-1+1/q}\right) = o_p(1).$$

For every $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ and $k > 0$ fixed, we have

$$\sup_{|s| \le k}\left| n_j^{1/6}\xi^S_{nj} \circ L_j\big(t, t + n_j^{-1/3}s\big] \right| \le k n_j^{-1/6}|\xi_{nj}| \sup_{t \in [0,1]} L'_j(t) = o_p(1).$$

Furthermore

$$n_0^{1/6}\xi_{n0} \circ L_0\big(t, t + n_0^{-1/3}s\big] = n^{1/6}\sum_{j=1}^J c_j^{1/2}\xi_{nj}L_j\big(t, t + n_0^{-1/3}s\big].$$

Hence, we have

$$\sup_{|u|\leq k}\left|n_0^{1/6}\xi_{n0}\circ L_0\big(t,t+n^{-1/3}u\big]\right|\leq kn^{-1/6}\sum_{j=1}^{J}c_j^{1/2}|\xi_{nj}|\sup_{t\in[0,1]}L_j'(t)=o_p(1).$$

Finally, according to (53), for $j=1,2,\dots,J$,

$$\begin{aligned}Z_{nt,j}(s)&=n_j^{1/6}W_{nj}\circ L_j\big(t,t+n_j^{-1/3}s)\big]\\&=W_{tj}\left(n_j^{1/3}\big(L_j(t+n_j^{-1/3}s)-L_j(t)\big)\right)\approx W_{tj}\left(L_j'(t)s\right).\end{aligned}$$

Because Brownian motion is uniformly continuous on compacta, it follows that for each $j=1,2,\dots,J$, the process $Z_{nj}(s)$ converges in the uniform topology on compacta to the process

$$Z_{tj}(s)=L_j'(t)^{1/2}W_j(s)$$

where $W_1,W_2,\dots,W_J$ are independent standard Brownian motions. Furthermore, for $j=0$, according to (53), we have that

$$Z_{nt,0}(s)=n^{1/6}W_{n0}\circ L_0\big(t,t+n^{-1/3}s)\big]=\sum_{j=1}^{J}c_j^{1/3}Z_{nt,j}(c_j^{1/3}s),\tag{60}$$

which converges in distribution to the process

$$\widetilde{Z}_{t0}(s)=\sum_{j=1}^{J}c_j^{1/2}L_j'(t)^{1/2}W_j(s)=L_0'(t)^{1/2}\widetilde{W}_{t0}(s),\tag{61}$$

where $\widetilde{W}_{t0}$ is defined in (14). We then conclude that for each $j=1,2,\dots,J$ and $S=E,B,W$, the process in (59) converges in the uniform topology on compacta to the process

$$\begin{aligned}&L_j'(t)^{1/2}B_j(t)^{1/2}W_j\left(u\right)-\frac{1}{2}|f_j'(t)|B_j(t)^2u^2+|f_j'(t)|B_j(t)^2xu-A_j(t)^{-1}B_j(t)a_ju\\&=L_j'(t)^{1/2}B_j(t)^{1/2}\left\{W_j(u)-u^2+2xu-a_ju\right\},\end{aligned}$$

and to $L_0'(t)^{1/2}B_0(t)^{1/2}\{\widetilde{W}_{t0}(u)-u^2+2xu-a_0u\}$ in the case $j=0$. According to Lemma 4 in [9], together with assumptions (A1) and (A2), the argmax on the left hand side of (58) is of order $O_p(1)$. This means we can apply Theorem 2.7 from [24]. Together with the fact that $\text{argmax}\{H(u)\}=\text{argmax}\{aH(u)+b\}$ for constants $a>0$ and $b\in\mathbb{R}$, this yields that for each $j=0,1,\dots,J$, $t\in(0,1)$ and $S=E,B,W$ fixed, the argmax in (58) converges in distribution to $\nu_j(x-a_j/2)$ and $\widetilde{\nu}_{t0}(x-a_0/2))$, respectively, where

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_j(c)&=\underset{u\in\mathbb{R}}{\text{argmax}}\left\{W_j(u)-(u-c)^2\right\},\quad j=1,2,\dots,J,\\\widetilde{\nu}_{t0}(c)&=\underset{u\in\mathbb{R}}{\text{argmax}}\left\{\widetilde{W}_{t0}(u)-(u-c)^2\right\}.\end{aligned}\tag{62}$$

To extend this to joint convergence, note that since the processes $Z_{nt,j}$, for $j=1,2,\dots,J$, are independent and $Z_{nt,0}$ satisfies (60), they converge in distribution jointly to $(\widetilde{Z}_{t0},Z_{t1},\dots,Z_{tJ})$. This implies joint convergence of the argmax's in (58); see e.g., Theorem 6.1 in [16], which is only proven for two argmax's but which can trivially be extended to joint convergence of more than two. We conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{A_j(t)x)\Phi^S_{nj,t}(x)\leq a_j\right\}\right)\to\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{\nu_j\left(x-\frac{a_j}{2}\right)\leq x\right\}\right)$$

$$=\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{2\nu_j\left(0\right)\leq a_j\right\}\right),$$

using the fact that $\nu_j(c)-c\overset{d}{=}\nu_j(0)$, for all $j=0,1,\dots,J$ and $c\in\mathbb{R}$. Now, let

$$D_j(s,x)=\text{left hand slope of } W_j(u)-u^2+2xu \text{ at } u=s.$$

Then, similar to (22), one has $\nu_j(c)\leq t$ if and only if $D_j(t,0)\leq -2c$, and it is straightforward to deduce that $2\nu_j(c)$ has the same distribution as $D_j(c,0)+4c$. Furthermore, by properties of the LCM, one also has $D_j(s,x)=D_j(s,0)+2x$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{2\nu_j\left(0\right)\leq a_j\right\}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{D_j(x,x)\leq a_j\right\}\right),$$

and since $\Phi_j(x)=D_j(x,x)$, this proves the lemma. □

Another ingredient to establish Lemma 4, is a mixing property of the Brownian motion slope process.

Lemma 11 *Suppose that $f_0=f_1=\cdots,f_J$. Then the process $\left\{\left(\widehat{f}^W_{n0}(t),\widehat{f}^W_{n1}(t),\dots,\widehat{f}^W_{nJ}(t)\right):t\in[0,1]\right\}$ is strong mixing. More specifically, for $d>0$,*

$$\sup|\mathbb{P}(A\cap B)-\mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|\leq\alpha_n(d)=C_1e^{-C_2nd^3},$$

where $C_1,C_2>0$ only depend on $f_0=f_1=\cdots=f_J$ and $c_1,c_2,\dots,c_J$, where the supremum is taken over all sets $A\in\sigma\{\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(s):j=0,1,\dots,J,\ 0<s\leq t\}$ and $B\in\sigma\{\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(u):j=0,1,\dots,J,\ t+d\leq u<1\}$.

Proof. Let $t\in(0,1)$ arbitrary and take $0<s_1\leq s_2\leq\cdots\leq s_k=t<t+d=u_1\leq u_2\leq\cdots\leq u_l<1$. Consider events

$$E_1=\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(s_1)\in B_{1j},\dots,\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(s_k)\in B_{kj}\right\},$$

$$E_2=\bigcap_{j=0}^{J}\left\{\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(u_1)\in C_{1j},\dots,\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(u_l)\in C_{lj}\right\},$$

for Borel sets $B_{1j},\dots,B_{kj}$ and $C_{1j},\dots,C_{lj}$ of $\mathbb{R}$, for $j=0,1,\dots,J$. Note that cylinder sets of the form E_1 and E_2 generate the σ-algebras $A\in\sigma\{\widehat{f}^W_{nj}(s):j=0,1,\dots,J,\ 0<s\leq t\}$

and $B \in \sigma\{\widehat{f}_{nj}^W(u) : j = 0, 1, \dots, J,\, t + d \le u < 1\}$, respectively. Let $\mathrm{CM}_I Z$ denote the least concave majorant of Z on the interval I. Define the event $S = \bigcap_{j=0}^J S_j$, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_j = \Big\{ & \left[\mathrm{CM}_{[0,1]} F_{nj}^W\right](u) = \left[\mathrm{CM}_{[0,t+d/2]} F_{nj}^W\right](u), \text{ for } u \in [0, t] \\ & \text{and } \left[\mathrm{CM}_{[0,1]} F_{nj}^W\right](u) = \left[\mathrm{CM}_{[t+d/2,1]} F_{nj}^W\right](u), \text{ for } u \in [t + d, 1] \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

where F_{nj}^W is defined in (18) and (19). Let $E_1' = E_1 \cap S$ and $E_2' = E_2 \cap S$. Then E_1' only depends on the processes $F_{n0}^W, F_{n1}^W, \dots, F_{nJ}^W$ before time $t + d/2$ and E_2' only depends on the processes $F_{n0}^W, F_{n1}^W, \dots, F_{nJ}^W$ after time $t + d/2$. Hence, since each process W_{nj}, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, is distributed like Brownian motion, it has independent increments, so that the events E_1' and E_2' are independent. This yields

$$|\mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap E_2) - \mathbb{P}(E_1)\mathbb{P}(E_2)| \le 3\mathbb{P}(S^c) \le 3 \sum_{j=0}^J \mathbb{P}\left(S_j^c\right).$$

Note that the concave majorants of F_{nj}^W on $[0, 1]$ and on $[0, t]$ coincide on $[0, t]$ as soon as they coincide at the boundary points. Hence, for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, we have that on the event S_j^c both concave majorants differ at t, which implies that they differ on the interval $[t - dn_j^{-1/3}, t + dn_j^{-1/3}]$. According to Lemma 1.3 in [30], this happens with probability bounded by $8 \exp(-C_j nd^3)$, where the constant $C_j > 0$ only depends on f_j and c_j. This proves the lemma. □

Finally, we need the following result on the slopes of dependent Brownian motions with drift.

Lemma 12 *For $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, $i \ne j$, $c > 0$, and $t \in [0, 1]$ fixed, $\mathbb{P}(c\Phi_i(0) = \Phi_j(0)) = 0$. where $\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \dots, \Phi_J$ and $\Phi_0 = \widetilde{\Phi}_{t0}$ are defined in Lemma 10.*

Proof: When $i, j \ge 1$, the statement is trivially true, because $\Phi_j(0)$ has the same distribution as $2\nu_j(0)$, as defined in (62), which has a bounded symmetric density according to Lemma 3.3 in [13]. Consider the case $i = 0$ and $j \ge 1$. Because $\widetilde{\Phi}_{t0}(0)$ also has the same distribution as $2\widetilde{\nu}_{t0}(0)$, it is equivalent to prove that $c^{-1}\nu_j(0) = \widetilde{\nu}_{t0}(0)$ with probability zero. By Brownian scaling, we have that

$$c^{-1}\nu_j(0) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ W_j(u) - c^{3/2}u^2 \right\}$$

and from (14) it follows that

$$\widetilde{\nu}_{t0}(0) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ a_j W_j(u) + aW(u) - u^2 \right\}$$

where

$$a_j = c_j^{1/2} \left(\frac{L_j'(t)}{L_0'(t)} \right)^{1/2}, \quad a = \left(\sum_{j \ne i} c_j \frac{L_j'(t)}{L_0'(t)} \right)^{1/2}, \quad W = \frac{1}{a} \sum_{m \ne j} c_m^{1/2} \left(\frac{L_m'(t)}{L_0'(t)} \right)^{1/2} W_m.$$

Note that W_j and W are independent standard Brownian motions. According to [6], with probability one there does not exist $u \in \mathbb{R}$ such that u is a local maximum for the process $X_1(u) = W_j(u) - c^{3/2}u^2$ and the process $X_2(u) = a_j W_j(u) + aW(u) - u^2$. This proves the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 4. We follow the line of reasoning as in Corollary 3.3 in [13]. To cover all cases $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ simultaneously, first introduce

$$X_{nj}(s) = \begin{cases} \xi_{nj} L_j(s) & , j = 1, 2, \ldots, J, \\ \xi_{n0}(L_0(s)) & , j = 0, \end{cases}$$

where ξ_{nj} is defined in (5), for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, and in (17), for $j = 0$. Note that according to (17), $X_{n0}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j^{1/2} X_{nj}(s)$. Next, for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, introduce the process

$$Z^{\xi}_{nj,t}(s) = Z^{B}_{nj,t}(s) + n_j^{-1/6} X'_{nj}(t)s,$$

where $Z^{B}_{nj,t}$ is defined in (55) and $n_0 = n$, and denote $\widehat{\phi}^{\xi}_{nj}(t)$ as the slope of the least concave majorant of $Z^{\xi}_{nj,t}(s)$ at $s = 0$. Then

$$\widehat{\phi}^{\xi}_{nj}(t) = \widehat{\phi}^{B}_{nj}(t) + n_j^{-1/6} X'_{nj}(t). \tag{63}$$

Because $Z^{B}_{nj,t}(s) = Z^{W}_{nj,t}(s) - n_j^{1/6}\{X_{nj}(t + n_j^{-1/3}s) - X_{nj}(t)\}$, it follows that

$$Z^{\xi}_{nj,t}(s) = Z^{W}_{nj,t}(s) - n_j^{1/6}\left(X_{nj}(t + n_j^{-1/3}s) - X_{nj}(t) - n_j^{-1/3} X'_{nj}(t)s\right).$$

Let $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ be the segment of the LCM of $Z^{\xi}_{nj,t}$ that contains zero, and $[\tau'_1, \tau'_2]$ the segment of the LCM of $Z^{W}_{nj,t}$ that contains zero. Define $a = \max(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \le 0$ and $b = \min(\tau_2, \tau'_2) \ge 0$. Note that we always have $a < b$, otherwise $\tau_1 = 0$ or $\tau'_1 = 0$, which is impossible by definition of the argmax. Then for any $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$,

$$\widehat{\phi}^{\xi}_{nj}(t) = \frac{Z^{\xi}_{nj,t}(a) - Z^{\xi}_{nj,t}(b)}{a - b} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\phi}^{W}_{nj}(t) = \frac{Z^{W}_{nj,t}(a) - Z^{W}_{nj,t}(b)}{a - b},$$

and

$$\left|\widehat{\phi}^{\xi}_{nj}(t) - \widehat{\phi}^{W}_{nj}(t)\right| \le n_j^{-1/2} \sup_{s \in [0,1]} |X''_{nj}(s)|, \tag{64}$$

uniformly in t. This means that it remains to show that

$$\int_0^1 |\widehat{\phi}^{B}_{ni}(t) - \widehat{\phi}^{B}_{nj}(t)| \,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 |\widehat{\phi}^{\xi}_{ni}(t) - \widehat{\phi}^{\xi}_{nj}(t)| \,\mathrm{d}t + o_p(n^{-1/6}).$$

However, if we define for $S = B, W$ and $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\psi}^{S}_{ij}(t) &= \widehat{\phi}^{S}_{ni}(t) - \widehat{\phi}^{S}_{nj}(t) \\ X_{ij}(t) &= c_i^{-1/6} X_{ni}(t) - c_j^{-1/6} X_{nj}(t), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 = 1$, then according to (63), it is equivalent to show

$$n^{1/6} \int_0^1 \left\{ |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| - |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \right\} \,\mathrm{d}t = o_p(1).$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/6} \int_0^1 \left\{ |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| - |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \right\} \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= n^{1/6} \int_0^1 \left\{ |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| - |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \right\} 1_{[0,\epsilon]}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad + n^{1/6} \int_0^1 \left\{ |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| - |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \right\} 1_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the independence between ξ_{nj} and B_{nj}, and hence between $X_{nj}(t)$ and $\widehat{\phi}_{nj}^B(t)$, the expectation of the first term on the right hand side is bounded from above by

$$\sup_{s \in [0,1]} \mathbb{E}|X'_{ij}(s)| \int_0^1 \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \leq \epsilon \right) \,\mathrm{d}t.$$

According to Lemma 10, it follows that for all $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \leq \epsilon \right) \to \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \frac{\Phi_i(0)}{c_{i1}(t)} - \frac{\Phi_j(0)}{c_{j1}(t)} \right| \leq \epsilon \right),$$

where Φ_0 is short for $\widetilde{\Phi}_{t0}$. By right continuity and Lemma 12,

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \frac{\Phi_i(0)}{c_{i1}(t)} - \frac{\Phi_0(0)}{c_{01}(t)} \right| \leq \epsilon \right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\Phi_i(0)}{c_{i1}(t)} = \frac{\Phi_0(0)}{c_{01}(t)} \right) = 0$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[n^{1/6} \int_0^1 \left\{ |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| - |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \right\} 1_{[0,\epsilon]}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \,\mathrm{d}t \right] = 0.$$

For the remaining integral we write

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/6} \int_0^1 \left\{ |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| - |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \right\} 1_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_0^1 1_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \frac{2X'_{ij}(t)\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)^2}{|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| + |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|} \,\mathrm{d}t \\ &= \int_0^1 1_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \frac{2X'_{ij}(t)\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)}{|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| + |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|} \,\mathrm{d}t + O_p(n^{-1/6}) \\ &= -\int_0^1 X'_{ij}(t) \,\mathrm{sign}(\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)) 1_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|) \,\mathrm{d}t + O_p(n^{-1/6}), \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that for $|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| > \epsilon$,

$$\left| \frac{2\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)}{|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) + n^{-1/6} X'_{ij}(t)| + |\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|} - \frac{\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)}{|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)|} \right| \leq \frac{n^{-1/6}|X'_{ij}(t)|}{\epsilon} + O_p(n^{-1/6}).$$

For $t \in [0,1]$ and $S = B, W$, let $\widehat{Y}_{ij}^S(t) = \operatorname{sign}(\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^S(t)) 1_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^S(t)|)$. Then, again by independence of ξ_{nj} and B_{nj}, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^1 X'_{ij}(t)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right\}^2 = 2\iint_{0<s<t<1} \mathbb{E}\left[X'_{ij}(s)X'_{ij}(t)\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(s)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t)\right]\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

for the cases $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$ and according to (9),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^1 X'_{i0}(t)\widehat{Y}_{i0}^B(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right\}^2 &\le J\sum_{j=1}^J c_j \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^1 X'_{ij}(t)\widehat{Y}_{i0}^B(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right\}^2 \\ &= 2J\sum_{j=1}^J c_j \iint_{0<s<t<1} \mathbb{E}\left[X'_{ij}(s)X'_{ij}(t)\right]\mathbb{E}\left[\widehat{Y}_{i0}^B(s)\widehat{Y}_{i0}^B(t)\right]\,\mathrm{d}s\,\mathrm{d}t,\end{aligned}$$

where for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, J$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X'_{ij}(s)X'_{ij}(t)\right] = \left(\frac{L'_i(s)L'_i(t)}{c_i^{1/3}} + \frac{L'_j(s)L'_j(t)}{c_j^{1/3}}\right).$$

Furthermore, for all $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J$,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(s)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t) - \mathbb{E}\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)\right| \le \mathbb{E}|\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(s) - \widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s)| + \mathbb{E}|\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t) - \widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)|.$$

For every $t \in [0,1]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t) - \widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)| \le 2\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) - \widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t)| > 2\epsilon) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \le \epsilon) + \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t)| \le \epsilon).$$

Note that for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \mathbb{E}|\widehat{\phi}_{nj}^B(t) - \widehat{\phi}_{nj}^W(t)| = O(n_j^{-1/6}). \tag{65}$$

This can be shown similar to (64) using that

$$Z_{nj,t}^B(s) = Z_{nj,t}^W(s) - n_j^{1/6}\left(X_{nj}(t + n_j^{-1/3}s) - X_{nj}(t)\right)$$

and

$$|X_{nj}(t + n_j^{-1/3}b) - X_{nj}(t + n^{-1/3}a)| \le n_j^{-1/3}(b-a)\sup_{t\in[0,1]}|X'_{nj}(t)|.$$

The Markov inequality together with (65) yields that $\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t) - \widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t)| > 2\epsilon)$ tends to zero, uniformly in $t \in [0,1]$. As before, according to Lemma 10,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^B(t)| \le \epsilon) = 0$$

and likewise for $\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t)| \le \epsilon)$. We conclude that for all $0 < s < t < 1$, $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left|\mathbb{E}\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(s)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t) - \mathbb{E}\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)\right| = 0.$$

Finally, for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, write

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)\right] = \operatorname{cov}\left(\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s), \widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)\right) + \mathbb{E}[\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s)]\mathbb{E}[\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)].$$

Because $(\widehat{\phi}_{ni}^W(t), \widehat{\phi}_{nj}^W(t))$ is strong mixing according to Lemma 11, also $\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t)$ is strong mixing. Then according to [18] (see also Lemma 3.1 in [13]), for every $0 < s < t < 1$ we get that

$$\left|\operatorname{cov}\left(\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(s), \widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)\right)\right| \le Ke^{-C_2 n(t-s)} \to 0.$$

Also for every $t \in (0, 1)$, according to Lemma 10, writing V_0 and Φ_0 for $\widetilde{\nu}_{t0}$ and $\widetilde{\Phi}_{t0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\widehat{Y}_{ij}^W(t)] &= \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t) > \epsilon) - \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\psi}_{ij}^W(t) < -\epsilon) \\
&\to \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\Phi_i(0)}{c_{1i}(t)} - \frac{\Phi_j(0)}{A_j(t)} > \epsilon\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\Phi_i(0)}{c_{1i}(t)} - \frac{\Phi_j(0)}{A_j(t)} < -\epsilon\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{2V_i(0)}{c_{1i}(t)} - \frac{2\nu_j(0)}{A_j(t)} > \epsilon\right) - \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{2V_i(0)}{c_{i1}(t)} - \frac{2\nu_j(0)}{A_j(t)} < -\epsilon\right) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

because $(-V_i(0), -\nu_j(0))$ has the same distribution as $(V_i(0), \nu_j(0))$. It follows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}\left\{\int_0^1 X'_{ij}(t)\widehat{Y}_{ij}^B(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right\}^2 = 0.$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

4.2 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

In this section we assume that assumptions (A0), (A1), (A2), (A3), (A4) hold. Now that we have established Lemmas 2, 3 and 4, we continue to investigate the right hand side of (24), i.e., integrals of the type

$$n^{1/3}\int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}_{ni}^W(a) - \widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)|\,\mathrm{d}a.$$

We proceed as in step 2 in [9] and approximate $n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a) - L_j(g_j(a))\right)$ by $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(g_j(a))$, where for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$,

$$\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) = \underset{|u| \le \log n}{\operatorname{argmax}}\left\{W_{tj}(u) - \frac{|f'_j(t)|}{2(L'_j(t))^2}u^2\right\} \tag{66}$$

with W_{tj} the Brownian motion defined in (53).

Lemma 13 *There exists a $C > 0$, such that for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ and $a \in [f_j(1) + n^{-1/3}(\log n)^2, f_j(0) - n^{-1/3}(\log n)^2]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left|n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g_j(a))\right) - \widetilde{V}_{nj}(g_j(a))\right| \le C\frac{n^{-1/6}}{\log n}.$$

Proof. For $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, we have

$$n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g_j(a))\right) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{u \in I_{nj}(a)} \left\{ W_{g_j(a),j}(u) - \frac{|f_j'(t)|}{2(L_j'(t))^2}u^2 + R_{nj}(a,u) \right\}$$

where W_{tj} and $I_{nj}(a)$ are defined in (53) and

$$\begin{aligned} R_{nj}(a,u) = n_j^{2/3}&\left(F_j \circ L_j^{-1} - aL_j^{-1}\right)\left(L_j(g_j(a)) + n_j^{-1/3}u\right) \\ &- n_j^{2/3}\left(F_j(g_j(a)) - ag_j(a)\right) + \frac{|f_j'(t)|}{2(L_j'(t))^2}u^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\widetilde{U}_{nj}^W(a) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{u \in [-\log n, \log n]} \left\{ W_{g_j(a),j}(u) - \frac{|f_j'(t)|}{2(L_j'(t))^2}u^2 + R_{nj}(a,u) \right\}.$$

Since $[-\log n, \log n] \subset I_{nj}(a)$, we can only have $n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g_j(a))\right) \neq \widetilde{U}_{nj}^W(a)$, if

$$n_j^{1/3}\left|L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g_j(a))\right| \geq \log n.$$

Furthermore, $|\widetilde{U}_{nj}^W(a)| \leq \log n$ and

$$\left|L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g_j(a))\right| \leq \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |L_j'(t)||\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a) - g_j(a)| \leq \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |L_j'(t)|,$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left|n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g_j(a))\right) - \widetilde{U}_{nj}^W(a)\right| \\ &\quad \leq \left(n_j^{1/3}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}|L_j'(t)| + \log n\right)\mathbb{P}\left(n_j^{1/3}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}|L_j'(t)|\left|\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a) - g_j(a)\right| \geq \log n\right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 8, the right hand term is of the order $o(n^{-1/6}/\log n)$. This means that it remains to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\widetilde{U}_{nj}^W(a) - \widetilde{V}_{nj}(g_j(a))\right| \leq C\frac{n^{-1/6}}{\log n}. \tag{67}$$

It follows from the assumptions on L_j and f_j that there exists $K > 0$ depending only on f_j and L_j such that for all $a \in (f_j(1), f_j(0))$,

$$\sup_{|u|\leq \log n} |R_{nj}(a,u)| \leq Kn^{-\alpha/3}(\log n)^3.$$

By assumption, $s > 3/4$, so Lemma 5 from [9] yields (67). □

Lemma 14 *Assume $f = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$. Then for every $i, j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, we have*

$$n^{1/3}\int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^E(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^E(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^1 \left|\frac{\widetilde{V}_{ni}(t)}{L_i'(t)c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)}{L_j'(t)c_j^{1/3}}\right| |f'(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t + o_p(n^{-1/6}).$$

Proof. By assumption, L_j' is bounded from below and $|L_j''|$ is bounded from above for every $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$. Moreover, integrating (46) with $g_j = g$ the inverse of f_0, one obtains that there exists $K > 0$ depending on f and L_j only such that

$$\mathbb{E}|\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a) - g(a)|^2 \leq K n^{-2/3}$$

for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, together with a Taylor expansion, (24) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^E(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^E(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} \left| \frac{L_i(\widehat{U}_{ni}^W(a)) - L_i(g(a))}{L_i'(g(a))} - \frac{L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g(a))}{L_j'(g(a))} \right| \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}) \\ &= n^{1/3} \int_{f(1)+\delta_n}^{f(0)-\delta_n} \left| \frac{L_i(\widehat{U}_{ni}^W(a)) - L_i(g(a))}{L_i'(g(a))} - \frac{L_j(\widehat{U}_{nj}^W(a)) - L_j(g(a))}{L_j'(g(a))} \right| \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_n = n^{-1/3}(\log n)^2$. From Lemma 13 together with the fact that $|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)| \leq \log n$ for every j and t, it then follows that

$$n^{1/3} \int_0^1 |\widehat{f}_{ni}^E(t) - \widehat{f}_{nj}^E(t)| \, \mathrm{d}t = \int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} \left| \frac{\widetilde{V}_{ni}(g(a))}{L_i'(g(a)) c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\widetilde{V}_{nj}(g(a))}{L_j'(g(a)) c_j^{1/3}} \right| \mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6}).$$

The change of variable $t = g(a)$ finally yields the lemma. □

From Lemma 14 we conclude that under $f = f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$, for $k = 1, 2$, the test statistic S_{nk} satisfies

$$n^{1/3} S_{nk} = \int_0^1 Y_{nk}(t) \, \mathrm{d}t + o_p(n^{-1/6}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n1}(t) &= \sum_{i<j} \left| \frac{\widetilde{V}_{ni}(t)}{L_i'(t) c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)}{L_j'(t) c_j^{1/3}} \right| |f'(t)|, \\ Y_{n2}(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t)}{L_0'(t)} - \frac{\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)}{L_j'(t) c_j^{1/3}} \right| |f'(t)|. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Therefore, in order to prove Theorems 1 and 2, it remains to show that under $f = f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$, for $k = 1, 2$,

$$n^{1/6} \left(\int_0^1 Y_{nk}(t) \, \mathrm{d}t - m_k \right)$$

converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian variable with a finite variance σ_k^2. To determine m_k and σ_k^2, we have to deal with joint distributions of $\widetilde{V}_{ni}(t)$ and $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$, for different $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, and with covariances between $\widetilde{V}_{ni}(s)$ and $\widetilde{V}_{ni}(t)$, for s and t close to each other.

We will approximate $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(s)$ and $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$ with the variable $V_{tj}(s)$ defined as follows. For all $t \in (0,1)$ and for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, we define

$$V_{tj}(s) = \underset{u \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left\{ W_{tj}(u) - \frac{|f'(s)|}{2(L_j'(s))^2} u^2 \right\}, \tag{69}$$

where the process $W_{tj}(u)$ is defined in (53). Recall that the processes W_{tj}, for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, are independent Brownian motions, whose joint distribution of $(W_{t1}, W_{t2}, \ldots, W_{tJ})$ does not depend on n. Note that from (53) it follows that

$$W_{t0}(u) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j^{1/3} W_{tj} \left(n_j^{1/3} \left\{ L_j \circ L_0^{-1}(L_0(t) + n^{-1/3}u) - L_j(t) \right\} \right). \tag{70}$$

Although, due to (11), W_{t0} itself is distributed as standard Brownian motion, the joint distribution of $(W_{t0}, W_{t1}, \ldots, W_{tJ})$ does depend on n. For this reason, we approximate W_{t0} with

$$\widetilde{W}_{t0}(u) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j^{1/3} W_{tj} \left(c_j^{1/3} \frac{L_j'(t)}{L_0'(t)} u \right), \tag{71}$$

and define

$$V_{t0}(s) = \underset{u \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left\{ \widetilde{W}_{t0}(u) - \frac{|f'(s)|}{2(L_0'(s))^2} u^2 \right\}. \tag{72}$$

Note that from (11) it follows that also $\widetilde{W}_{t0}$ is distributed like a standard Brownian motion, but this time it is a linear combination of the W_{tj}'s not depending on n, so that the joint distribution of $(\widetilde{W}_{t0}, W_{t1}, W_{t2}, \ldots, W_{tJ})$ is independent of n. The latter is important to determine an expression for the limiting variance σ_2^2 not depending on n. On the other hand, the approximation of $\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t)$ by $V_{t0}(t)$ is not sufficient to replace the expectation of $n^{1/3} S_{n2}$ by a constant m_2 not depending on n. For this we will use

$$V_{t0}'(s) = \underset{u \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \left\{ W_{t0}(u) - \frac{|f'(s)|}{2(L_0'(s))^2} u^2 \right\}, \tag{73}$$

where W_{t0} is from (70). The following lemma provides approximations of $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$.

Lemma 15 *For $r > 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{1/r} \left| \widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t) \right|^r &= o(n^{-1/6}), \quad \textit{for } j = 1, 2 \ldots, J, \\ \mathbb{E}^{1/r} \left| \widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) - V_{t0}'(t) \right|^r &= o(n^{-1/6}), \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

uniformly in $t \in (0,1)$. Furthermore, let $A > 0$ and $r \in (1, 2\alpha)$, where $\alpha > 3/4$ is taken from (A4). Then,

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/r} \left| \widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(s) \right|^r = o(\log n)^{-1}, \tag{75}$$

uniformly in $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, and $s, t \in (0,1)$, such that $|s - t| \leq An^{-1/3} \log n$.

Proof: Similar to (51), one can prove that there exists $K_1 > 0$, such that for all $s, t \in (0, 1)$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ and $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|V_{tj}(s)| > x) \leq 2\exp(-K_1 x^3), \tag{76}$$

and integrating (76) yields

$$\mathbb{E}|V_{tj}(s)|^\gamma \leq K_2, \tag{77}$$

for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, and $\gamma > 0$, where $K_2 > 0$ depends only on γ, the L_j's and f. To prove (74), first consider the cases $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. By Hölder's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t)\right|^r \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t)\right|^{2r} \mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) \neq V_{tj}(t)\right)}.$$

But, according to (66) and (69), the argmax $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$ can differ from $V_{tj}(t)$ only if $|V_{tj}(t)| > \log n$, so from (76), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) \neq V_{tj}(t)\right) \leq 2\exp(-K_1(\log n)^3).$$

Moreover, $|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t)| \leq 2|V_{tj}(t)|$. Therefore, (77) with $\gamma = 2r$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t)\right|^r \leq 2^{r+1/2} K_2^{1/2} \exp(-K_1(\log n)^3/2), \tag{78}$$

uniformly in $t \in (0, 1)$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. This proves (74) for the cases $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. The case $j = 0$ in (74) is proven completely similar.

We proceed with proving (75). From the convexity of $x \mapsto x^r$ we deduce that for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$ and $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \leq 2^{r-1}\mathbb{E}\left|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t)\right|^r + 2^{r-1}\mathbb{E}\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r. \tag{79}$$

To deal with the second term on the right-hand side of (79), define the event

$$A_n = \{|V_{tj}(t)| \leq \log n, |V_{tj}(s)| \leq \log n\},$$

and note that from the Hölder inequality, it follows that for all $s, t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \mathbb{1}_{A_n}\right] + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^{2r} \mathbb{P}\left(A_n^c\right)}.$$

Therefore, together with (76) and (77), we find

$$\mathbb{E}\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \mathbb{1}_{A_n}\right] + K_3 \exp\left(-\frac{K_1}{2}(\log n)^3\right).$$

Since $|s - t| \leq An^{-1/3}\log n$, from (69) and (A4) it follows that the difference between the drifts of the processes corresponding to $V_{tj}(t)$ and $V_{tj}(s)$ satisfies condition (ii) of Lemma 5 in [9]. Since $r < 2\alpha$, from Lemma 5 in [9] we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \mathbb{1}_{A_n}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left(\left|V_{tj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r \mathbb{1}_{|V_{tj}(t)| \leq \log n} \mathbb{1}_{|V_{tj}(s)| \leq \log n}\right) \leq K_4 \left(\frac{n^{-1/6}}{\log n}\right)^r.$$

Hence, for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, and $s, t \in [0, 1]$, such that $|s - t| \leq An^{-1/3} \log n$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(s) \right|^r \leq 2^{r-1} \mathbb{E} \left| \widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t) \right|^r + K_5 \left(\frac{n^{-1/6}}{\log n} \right)^r . \tag{80}$$

For $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, the first term on the right hand side of (80) can be bounded together with (78). In particular we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/r} \left| \widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(t) \right|^r = o(1/\log n), \tag{81}$$

uniformly in $t \in (0, 1)$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. Next, consider the case $j = 0$. By Hölder's inequality, for every $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) - V_{t0}(t)|^r \leq \delta + \sqrt{\mathbb{E} |\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) - V_{t0}(t)|^{2r} \mathbb{P}(|\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) - V_{t0}(t)| > \delta)}, \tag{82}$$

where $\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t)$ is defined in (66), and can be written as

$$\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) = \operatorname*{argmax}_{|u| \leq \log n} \left\{ \widetilde{W}_{t0}(u) - \frac{|f'(s)|}{2(L_0'(s))^2} u^2 + R_n(s, t, u) \right\},$$

with

$$\sup_{|u| \leq \log n} |R_n(s, t, u)| \leq \left| \frac{|f'(s)|}{2(L_0'(s))^2} - \frac{|f'(t)|}{2(L_0'(t))^2} \right| (\log n)^2 + \sup_{|u| \leq \log n} \left| \widetilde{W}_{t0}(u) - W_{t0}(u) \right| .$$

In order to bound the probability in (82), we use Proposition 1 in [8] (see also the comments just above this proposition), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) - V_{t0}(t)| > \delta) \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ 2 \sup_{|u| \leq \log n} |R_n(s, t, u)| > x \delta^{3/2} \right\} &+ Cx \log n \\ &+ \mathbb{P}(|V_{t0}(t)| > \log n), \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

for $\delta = n^{-\epsilon}$, for some $\epsilon < 1/9$, and $x = \delta^{-3/2} n^{-1/6} (\log n)^2$. From (70) and (71), we obtain that for all $|s - t| \leq An^{-1/3} \log n$,

$$\sup_{|u| \leq \log n} |R_n(s, t, u)| \leq K_6 n^{-\alpha/3} (\log n)^3 + J \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} \sup_{|u| \leq \gamma_n, |u - v| \leq \delta_n} |W_{tj}(u) - W_{tj}(v)|,$$

where $\gamma_n = K_7 \log n$ and $\delta_n = K_7 n^{-1/3} (\log n)^2$. This means that for $y > K_6 n^{-\alpha/3} (\log n)^3$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{|u| \leq \log n} |R_n(s, t, u)| > y \right) \leq J \mathbb{P} \left(J \sup_{|u| \leq \gamma_n, |u - v| \leq \delta_n} |W_{tj}(u) - W_{tj}(v)| > \frac{y}{2} \right)$$

Let $M = \lfloor K_7 n^{1/3} (\log n)^{-1} \rfloor$ and for $k \in \{-M, \ldots, M\}$, let $t_k = kn^{-1/3} (\log n)^2$. Then, if $|u| \leq \gamma_n, |u - v| \leq \delta_n$, it follows that $|u - t_k| \leq n^{-1/3} (\log n)^2$ and $|v - t_k| \leq 2n^{-1/3} (\log n)^2$, for some $k \in \{-M, \ldots, M\}$. This means that, together with using

$$|W_{tj}(u) - W_{tj}(v)| \leq |W_{tj}(u) - W_{tj}(t_k)| + |W_{tj}(t_k) - W_{tj}(v)|,$$

the probability on the right hand side can be bounded by

$$2J \sum_{k=-M}^{M} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|v-t_k|\leq 2n^{-1/3}(\log n)^2} |W(t_k) - W(v)| > \frac{y}{4J} \right),$$

where W is a standard Brownian motion. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|u|\leq \log n} |R_n(s,t,u)| > y \right) &\leq 2J(2M+1)\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{|v|\leq 2n^{-1/3}(\log n)^2} |W(v)| > \frac{y}{4J} \right) \\ &\leq K_8 n^{1/3}(\log n)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{K_9 y^2 n^{1/3}}{(\log n)^2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Possibly enlarging the constant K_8, this inequality still holds for all $y > 0$ since for a large enough K_8, the right hand term becomes greater than one for $y \in (0, 2K_6 n^{-\alpha/3}(\log n)^3)$. Therefore, from (83),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t) - V_{t0}(t)| > \delta) \leq 2\exp\left(-K_8(\log n)^2\right) &+ Cn^{3\epsilon/2-1/6}(\log n)^3 \\ &+ 2\exp(-K_1(\log n)^3). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, from the definitions of $\widetilde{V}_{n0}$ and V_{t0} in (66) and (72), together with the fact that W_{t0} and $\widetilde{W}_{t0}$ are both distributed as standard Brownian motion, it is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}|\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t)|^\gamma \leq \mathbb{E}|V_{t0}(t)|^\gamma$, for every $\gamma > 0$, so it follows from (77) that for every $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}|\widetilde{V}_{n0}(t)|^\gamma \leq \mathbb{E}|V_{t0}(t)|^\gamma = O(1),$$

uniformly in $t \in (0,1)$. Hence, we deduce from (82) that (81) also holds with $j = 0$. From (80) we then obtain

$$\mathbb{E}^{1/r}\left|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)\right|^r = o(1/\log n)$$

uniformly in $j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$ and s, t such that $|s - t| \leq An^{-1/3}\log n$. □

In the following lemma, we prove that the variance of the above variable has a finite limit under $f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$.

Lemma 16 *For $k = 1, 2$, let*

$$v_{nk} = \operatorname{var}\left(\int_0^1 Y_{nk}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t \right).$$

Under $f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$, $n^{1/3}v_{nk}$ has a finite limit σ_k^2, as $n \to \infty$, where σ_1^2 is defined in Theorem 1 and σ_2^2 is defined in Theorem 2.

Proof. For $k = 1, 2$, we have

$$v_{nk} = 2\int_0^1 \int_s^1 \operatorname{cov}(Y_{nk}(t), Y_{nk}(s))\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Note that by definition of $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$ in (66), the random variable $Y_{nk}(t)$, defined in (68), depends only on the increments of W_{nj} over a neigbourhood of $L_j(t)$ with radius of the order $O(n^{-1/3}\log n)$, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$. But for every $s, t \in [0, 1]$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$, we have

$$|L_j(t) - L_j(s)| \geq |t - s| \inf_{u \in [0,1]} |L_j'(u)|,$$

where the infimum is positive according to (A3). Setting $a_n = An^{-1/3}\log n$, for some large enough $A > 0$, we find that $Y_{nk}(t)$ is independent of $Y_{nk}(s)$ for every $|t - s| \geq a_n$. This means that in for $k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_{n1} &= 2\int_0^1 \int_s^{1\wedge(s+a_n)} \operatorname{cov}(Y_{n1}(t), Y_{n1}(s))\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s \\ &= 2\sum_{i<j}\sum_{l<m}\int_0^1 \int_s^{1\wedge(s+a_n)} |f'(s)||f'(t)|\widetilde{C}_{n,iljm}(s,t)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s, \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where

$$\widetilde{C}_{n,iljm}(s,t) = \operatorname{cov}\left(\left|\frac{\widetilde{V}_{ni}(s)}{L_i'(s)c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{\widetilde{V}_{nj}(s)}{L_j'(s)c_j^{1/3}}\right|, \left|\frac{\widetilde{V}_{nl}(t)}{L_l'(t)c_l^{1/3}} - \frac{\widetilde{V}_{nm}(t)}{L_m'(t)c_m^{1/3}}\right|\right),$$

with $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$ defined in (66). Next, we approximate both $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(s)$ and $\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t)$ with the variable $V_{tj}(s)$, defined in (69) and (72). According to (75), we have $\mathbb{E}^{1/r}|\widetilde{V}_{nj}(t) - V_{tj}(s)|^r = o(1/\log n)$, uniformly in $j = 0, 1, \dots, J$ and s, t such that $|s - t| \leq a_n$. It thus follows from (85), together with Hölder's inequality, that

$$v_{n1} = 2\sum_{i<j}\sum_{l<m}\int_0^1 \int_s^{1\wedge(s+a_n)} |f'(s)|^2 C_{iljm}(s,t)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s + o(n^{-1/3}),$$

where

$$C_{iljm}(s,t) = \operatorname{cov}\left(\left|\frac{V_{ti}(s)}{L_i'(s)c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{V_{tj}(s)}{L_j'(s)c_j^{1/3}}\right|, \left|\frac{V_{sl}(s)}{L_l'(s)c_l^{1/3}} - \frac{V_{sm}(s)}{L_m'(s)c_m^{1/3}}\right|\right).$$

Let $d_j(s) = |f'(s)|/(2L_j'(s)^2)$. From (69) and (53), we have for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$,

$$\begin{aligned} &d_j(s)^{2/3}V_{tj}(s) \\ &= \operatorname*{argmax}_{u\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{W_{tj}\left(d_j(s)^{-2/3}u\right) - d_j(s)^{-1/3}u^2\right\} \\ &= \operatorname*{argmax}_{u\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{W_{sj}\left(d_j(s)^{-2/3}\left[u + n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(t) - L_j(s)\right)d_j(s)^{2/3}\right]\right) - d_j(s)^{-1/3}u^2\right\} \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \operatorname*{argmax}_{u\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{W_j\left(u + n_j^{1/3}\left(L_j(t) - L_j(s)\right)d_j(s)^{2/3}\right) - u^2\right\} \\ &= \operatorname*{argmax}_{u\in\mathbb{R}}\left\{W_j\left(u + n^{1/3}(t-s)|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}\frac{c_j^{1/3}}{L_j'(s)^{1/3}}\right) - u^2 + R_n'(s,t,u)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

where W_j is a standard Brownian motion and where for every $|t - s| \leq a_n$,

$$\sup_{|u|\leq\log n}|R_n'(s,t,u)| \leq \sup_{|u|\leq K\log n, |u-v|\leq K'n^{-1/3}(\log n)^2}|W_j(u) - W_j(v)|.$$

For $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, let ζ_j be defined by (6). We can bound tail probabilities of $\sup R'_n(s,t,u)$ similar to (84). Then using the same reasoning as in (82) and (83), from which we obtained (81) for the case $j = 0$, we now conclude that for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\left(\frac{|f'(s)|}{2(L'_j(s))^2}\right)^{2/3} V_{tj}(s) - \zeta_j\left(n^{1/3}(t-s)|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}\frac{c_j^{1/3}}{L'_j(s)^{1/3}}\right)\right| = o(1/\log n),$$

or equivalently

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\frac{V_{tj}(s)}{L'_j(s)c_j^{1/3}} - \left(\frac{4L'_j(s)}{c_j|f'(s)|^2}\right)^{1/3}\zeta_j\left(n^{1/3}(t-s)|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}\frac{c_j^{1/3}}{L'_j(s)^{1/3}}\right)\right| = o(1/\log n).$$

Change of variable $t' = n^{1/3}(t-s)|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}$, then gives

$$n^{1/3}v_{n1} = 8\sum_{i<j}\sum_{l<m}\int_0^1\int_0^{a'_n}\mathrm{cov}\left(|Y_{si}(t') - Y_{sj}(t')|, |Y_{sl}(0) - Y_{sm}(0)|\right)\,\mathrm{d}t'\,\mathrm{d}s + o(1),$$

where $a'_n = A\log n|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}$ and where for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$,

$$Y_{sj}(t) = \frac{L'_j(s)^{1/3}}{c_j^{1/3}}\zeta_j\left(\frac{c_j^{1/3}t}{L'_j(s)^{1/3}}\right),$$

We finish the proof for the case $k = 1$, by showing that there exist absolute constants K and K' such that

$$|\mathrm{cov}\left(|Y_{si}(t) - Y_{sj}(t)|, |Y_{sl}(0) - Y_{sm}(0)|\right)| \leq K\exp(-K't^3), \tag{86}$$

because then, for $k = 1$, the lemma follows from the dominated convergence theorem. To prove (86), for $d > 0$, let

$$\zeta_{jd}(c) = \underset{|u|\leq d}{\mathrm{argmax}}\left\{W_j(u+c) - u^2\right\}, \tag{87}$$

define $Y^d_{sj}(t)$ similar to $Y_{sj}(t)$, with ζ_j replaced by ζ_{jd}. If we take

$$d = (t/4)\min_{1\leq j\leq J}c_j^{1/3}\left(\sup_{s\in[0,1]}L'_j(s)\right)^{-1/3},$$

then $Y^d_{si}(t) - Y^d_{sj}(t)$ and $Y^d_{sl}(0) - Y^d_{sm}(0)$ are independent for all $i, j, l, m = 1, 2, \ldots, J$ and $s \in [0,1]$, since $\zeta_{jd}(c)$ only depends on $W_j(u)$, for $u \in [c-d, c+d]$. Furthermore, $\zeta_{jd}(c) \neq \zeta_j(c)$ if and only if $|\zeta_j(c)| > d$, and similar to (76) and (77), we find that $\mathbb{P}(|\zeta_j(c)| > d) \leq 2\exp\left(-K_1d^3\right)$ and $\mathbb{E}|\zeta_j(c)|^\gamma| \leq K_2$, for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$, $\gamma > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, there exist $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|Y_{si}(t)| > d\right) \leq 2\exp(-C_1d^3) \tag{88}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|Y^d_{si}(t)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|Y_{si}(t)|^2 \leq \min_{1\leq j\leq J}c_j^{-2/3}\sup_{s\in[0,1]}L'_j(s)^{2/3}\sup_{c\in\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{E}|\zeta_j(c)|^2 \leq C_2. \tag{89}$$

By Hölder's inequality, for any real valued random variables X, X', Y and Y', we have

$$\left|\mathrm{cov}(X,Y) - \mathrm{cov}(X',Y')\right| \le \mathbb{E}^{1/2}|X|^2\mathbb{E}^{1/2}|Y-Y'|^2 + \mathbb{E}^{1/2}|Y'|^2\mathbb{E}^{1/2}|X-X'|^2,$$

and similar to (78),

$$E\left|Y_{si}^d(t) - Y_{sj}^d(t)\right|^2 \le C_3 \exp\left(-C_4 t^3\right),$$

uniformly in $s \in [0,1]$ and $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, J$. Together with (88) and (89), this proves (86).

The proof for the case $k = 2$ is similar. As before, from (75),

$$v_{n2} = 2\sum_{i=1}^J\sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 \int_s^{1\wedge(s+a_n)} |f'(s)|^2 C_{ij}(s,t)\,\mathrm{d}t\,\mathrm{d}s + o(n^{-1/3}),$$

where

$$C_{ij}(s,t) = \mathrm{cov}\left(\left|\frac{V_{ti}(s)}{L_i'(s)c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{V_{t0}(s)}{L_0'(s)}\right|, \left|\frac{V_{sj}(s)}{L_j'(s)c_j^{1/3}} - \frac{V_{s0}(s)}{L_0'(s)}\right|\right),$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\frac{V_{t0}(s)}{L_0'(s)} - \left(\frac{4L_0'(s)}{|f'(s)|^2}\right)^{1/3}\widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}\left(n^{1/3}(t-s)|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}\frac{1}{L_0'(s)^{1/3}}\right)\right| = o(1/\log n).$$

where $\widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}$ is defined in (13). After change of variables $t' = n^{1/3}(t-s)|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}$, we obtain

$$n^{1/3}v_{n2} = 2\sum_{i=1}^J\sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 \int_0^{a_n'} \mathrm{cov}\left(|Y_{si}(t') - Y_{s0}(t')|, |Y_{sj}(0) - Y_{s0}(0)|\right)\,\mathrm{d}t'\,\mathrm{d}s + o(1),$$

where $a_n' = A\log n|f'(s)/2|^{2/3}$ and

$$Y_{s0}(t) = L_0'(s)^{1/3}\widetilde{\zeta}_{t0}\left(\frac{t}{L_0'(s)^{1/3}}\right),$$

Similar to the reasoning above, (86) can be shown for the case $j = m = 0$, so that the lemma follows for the case $k = 2$, by application of the dominated convergence theorem. □

We are now in position to complete the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

Proof of Theorems 1 and 2. Define

$$m_1 := \sum_{i<j}\int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{V_{ti}(t)}{L_i'(t)c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{V_{tj}(t)}{L_j'(t)c_j^{1/3}}\right| |f'(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t \tag{90}$$

and

$$m_2 := \sum_{j=1}^J \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left|\frac{V_{ti}(t)}{L_i'(t)c_i^{1/3}} - \frac{V_{t0}'(t)}{L_0'(t)}\right| |f'(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t, \tag{91}$$

where $V_{tj}(t)$ and $V'_{t0}(t)$ are defined in (69) and (73). From Lemma 15 we then obtain for $k = 1, 2$,

$$n^{1/6}\left(m_k - \mathbb{E}\int_0^1 Y_{nk}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right) = o(n^{-1/6}).$$

Note that for $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$,

$$\frac{|f'(t)|}{L'_j(t)c_j^{1/3}} V_{tj}(t) \overset{d}{=} (4|f'(t)|)^{1/3}\frac{L'_j(t)^{1/3}}{c_j^{1/3}}\zeta_j(0) = (4|f'(t)|)^{1/3} Y_{sj}(0),$$

where ζ_j and Y_{sj} are defined in (6) and (7), so that

$$m_1 = \sum_{i<j}\int_0^1 (4|f'(t)|)^{1/3}\mathbb{E}\left|Y_{si}(0) - Y_{sj}(0)\right|\,\mathrm{d}t$$

Similarly

$$\frac{|f'(t)|}{L'_0(t)} V'_{t0}(t) \overset{d}{=} (4|f'(t)|)^{1/3} L'_0(t)^{1/3}\widetilde{\zeta}'_{t0}(0),$$

where $\widetilde{\zeta}'_{t0}$ is defined in (13), so that

$$m_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{J}\int_0^1 (4|f'(t)|)^{1/3}\mathbb{E}\left|L'_0(t)^{1/3}\widehat{\zeta}_{t0}(0) - \frac{L'_j(t)^{1/3}}{c_j^{1/3}}\zeta_j(0)\right|\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Therefore, in order to prove Theorems 1 and 2, it remains to show that, for $k = 1, 2$, under $f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_J$,

$$n^{1/6}\left(\int_0^1 Y_{nk}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \mathbb{E}\int_0^1 Y_{nk}(t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right)$$

converges in distribution to a centered Gaussian variable with variance σ_k^2. This can be done using the method of big blocks and small blocks, similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [13]. The details are omitted. □

4.3 Proofs for Section 3

Proof of Lemma 5: Since $\alpha > 3/4$, we have $(\alpha+1)/(2\alpha+3) > 1/3$. Because condition (26) holds on A_n and because $n^{-\gamma}/\varepsilon_n$ tends to zero as $n \to \infty$ for any $\gamma > 0$, also (28) holds on A_n. To prove (29) on A_n, let $\varepsilon'_n = \min(\varepsilon_n, 1/C)$, where $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon_n > 0$ are taken from (A4) and (A*). Then, by assumption f_0 and $\widetilde{f}_n$ are differentiable, in such a way that the first derivative has modulus of continuity $w(x) \leq |x|^\alpha/\varepsilon'_n$. Then, from Proposition 2 in [43], which also holds with the sup-norm, it follows that there are positive constants C_1 and C_2, such that on A_n,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}'_n(t) - f'_0(t)| &\leq C_1 b_n^\alpha/\varepsilon'_n + C_2 b_n^{-1}\sup_{t\in[0,1]}|\widetilde{f}_n(t) - f_0(t)| \\ &\leq C_1 b_n^\alpha/\varepsilon'_n + C_2 b_n^{-1} n^{-\frac{\alpha+1}{2\alpha+3}}/\varepsilon'_n,\end{aligned}$$

where (b_n) may be any sequence tending to zero. With $b_n = n^{-1/(2\alpha+3)}$, it follows that on A_n,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}_n'(t) - f_0'(t)| \leq (C_1 + C_2)n^{-\alpha/(2\alpha+3)}/\varepsilon_n'.$$

Because $\alpha > 3/4$, we have $\alpha/(2\alpha+3) > 1/6$ and since $n^{-\gamma}/\varepsilon_n' \to 0$ for any $\gamma > 0$, condition (29) holds on A_n. Together with (A1), under $f_0 = f_1 = \cdots = f_J$, this implies

$$\inf_{t\in[0,1]}(-\widetilde{f}_n'(t)) \geq \frac{1}{2}\inf_{t\in[0,1]}(-f_0'(t)) > 0.$$

In particular, $\widetilde{f}_n$ is negative on A_n, so that $\widetilde{f}_n$ is decreasing on this event. Likewise,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}_n'(t)| \leq 2 \sup_{t\in[0,1]} |f_0'(t)| < \infty$$

which proves (30) and completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 6: With $l = 0, 1, 2$, the lth derivative of $\widetilde{f}_n$ on $[h_n, 1-h_n]$ is given by

$$\widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t) = \frac{1}{h_n^{2+l}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} F_{n0}(x)K^{(l+1)}\left(\frac{t-x}{h_n}\right) \mathrm{d}x.$$

It follows from Lemma 1 below that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |F_{n0}(t) - F(t) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}B_{n0}\circ L_0(t)| = O_p(n^{-1+1/q}),$$

where $F = F_1 = \cdots = F_J$ and L_0 and B_{n0} are defined by (11) and (10), respectively. Combining this with the fact that $K^{(l+1)}$ is bounded and supported on $[-1, 1]$, yields that on $[h_n, 1-h_n]$,

$$\widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t) = \frac{1}{h_n^{2+l}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left(F(x) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}B_{n0}\circ L_0(x)\right)K^{(l+1)}\left(\frac{t-x}{h_n}\right)\mathrm{d}x + O_p\left(\frac{n^{-1+1/q}}{h_n^{l+1}}\right),$$

where the O_p is uniform in $t \in [h_n, 1-h_n]$. Now, since $h_n \sim n^{-1/5}$, with the change of variable $u = (t-x)/h_n$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t) = \frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\Big(F(t-uh_n) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}B_{n0}\circ L_0(t-uh_n)\Big)K^{(l+1)}(u)\,\mathrm{d}u \\ + O_p\left(n^{-4/5+1/q+l/5}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

We have $K^{(l)}(1) = K^{(l)}(-1) = 0$, since K is supported on $[-1, 1]$ and is three times continuously differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}\sqrt{n}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} B_{n0}\circ L_0(t-uh_n)K^{(l+1)}(u)\ \mathrm{d}u\right| \\ &= \left|\frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}\sqrt{n}}\int_{-1}^{1}\left(B_{n0}\circ L_0(t-uh_n) - B_{n0}\circ L_0(t)\right)K^{(l+1)}(u)\ \mathrm{d}u\right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}\sqrt{n}}\sup_{y\in[L_0(0),L_0(1)],\,|x-y|\leq Ch_n}|B_{n0}(x) - B_{n0}(y)|\int_{\mathbb{R}}\left|K^{(l+1)}(u)\right|\ \mathrm{d}u,\end{aligned}$$

where $C = \sup_{t\in[0,1]} L_0'(t)$. Although B_{n0} is neither Brownian motion nor Brownian bridge, it is a linear combination of B_{nj}, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, J$. For this reason, using standard properties of Brownian motion and Brownian bridge together with the fact that $h_n \sim n^{-1/5}$, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}\sqrt{n}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} B_{n0} \circ L_0(t - uh_n) K^{(l+1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = O_p\left(n^{-2/5+l/5}\sqrt{\log n}\right),$$

where the O_p is uniform in $t \in [h_n, 1-h_n]$. Since, by assumption $q > 6$, together with (92), this yields

$$\widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t) = \frac{1}{h_n^{1+l}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F(t - uh_n) K^{(l+1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u + O_p\left(n^{-2/5+l/5}\sqrt{\log n}\right),$$

where the O_p is uniform in $t \in [h_n, 1-h_n]$. Uniformly in $t \in [h_n, 1-h_n]$ and $u \in [-1, 1]$ we have

$$F(t - uh_n) = F(t) - uh_n f(t) + \frac{1}{2}u^2 h_n^2 f'(t) + O(h_n^3).$$

Since, for $l = 0, 1, 2$, we have $\int K^{(l+1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = 0$, we conclude that uniformly on $[h_n, 1-h_n]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t) = -\frac{f(t)}{h_n^l} \int_{\mathbb{R}} uK^{(l+1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u + \frac{h_n^{1-l}}{2} f'(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 K^{(l+1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u \\ + O(h_n^{2-l}) + O_p\left(n^{-2/5+l/5}\sqrt{\log n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

From our assumptions on K together with integration by parts, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} uK^{(3)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 K^{(3)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = \int_{\mathbb{R}} uK^{(2)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 K^{(1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = 0. \tag{93}$$

Therefore, in the case $l = 2$ we obtain that $\widetilde{f}_n^{(2)}(t) = O_p(\sqrt{\log n})$ uniformly on $[h_n, 1-h_n]$. Since $\widetilde{f}_n^{(2)}$ is constant on $[0, h_n]$ and $[1-h_n, 1]$, this implies that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}_n^{(2)}(t)| = O_p(\sqrt{\log n}).$$

In particular, if $A_n' = \{\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}_n^{(2)}(t)| \leq \log n\}$, then $\mathbb{P}(A_n') \to 1$. Moreover, since $\widetilde{f}_n$ is twice differentiable, (27) holds on A_n' with $s = 1$ and $\varepsilon_n = 1/\log n$. In the cases $l = 0, 1$, using (93) together with the facts that $\int uK^{(1)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = -1$ and $\int u^2 K^{(2)}(u)\, \mathrm{d}u = 2$, we obtain

$$\widetilde{f}_n^{(l)}(t) = f^{(l)}(t) + O(h_n^{2-l}) + O_p\left(n^{-2/5+l/5}\sqrt{\log n}\right),$$

uniformly on $[h_n, 1-h_n]$. Together with the definition of $\widetilde{f}_n$ on $[0, h_n]$ and $[1-h_n, 1]$, we get that uniformly on $[0, 1]$,

$$\widetilde{f}_n' = f' + O_p(n^{-1/5}\sqrt{\log n}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{f}_n = f + O_p(n^{-2/5}\sqrt{\log n}).$$

Therefore, if $A_n'' = \{\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |\widetilde{f}_n(t) - f(t)| \leq n^{-2/5}\log n\}$, then $\mathbb{P}(A_n'') \to 1$, and (26) holds on the event A_n'' with $s = 1$ and $\varepsilon_n = 1/\log n$. Setting $A_n = A_n' \cap A_n''$ completes the proof of the lemma. □

Sketch of proof for Theorems 3, 4, 5 and 6 That assumptions (A1),...,(A4) are fulfilled in all the considered models is proved in [9], see her Theorems 3, 5, 6. In the monotone regression model, the embedding is with a Brownian motion and $L_j(t) = t\tau_j^2$; in the density model, the embedding is with a Brownian Bridge and $L_j = F_j$; in the random censorship model, the embedding is with a Brownian motion and

$$L_j(t) = \int_0^t \frac{f_j(x)}{(1 - G_j(x))(1 - H_j(x))} \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Moreover, Assumption (A0) is clearly satisfied since all the original observations are mutually independent, so Theorems 1 and 2 apply in all these models and it suffices to prove that (31) also holds under H_0. Hereafter, we assume $f_1 = \cdots = f_J = f$ and $\widetilde{f}_n$ satisfies (A*).

Note that, in order to prove convergence in probability, we can restrict ourselves to an event whose probability tends to one as $n \to \infty$. Thus, thanks to Lemma 5, we assume in the sequel that $\widetilde{f}_n$ is decreasing on $[0, 1]$ and satisfies (27), (28), (29) and (30) for some positive C_0, C_1, $s \in (3/4, 1]$, and ε_n such that $n^{-\gamma}/\varepsilon_n$ tends to zero as $n \to \infty$ for any $\gamma > 0$. Moreover, recall that a sequence of random variables X_n converges in probability to a random variable X if, and only if, every subsequence has a further subsequence along which X_n converges almost surely to X. Thus, in the three considered models, if a sequence of random variables, which is measurable with respect to the original observations, converges in probability, we can assume for simplicity that it converges almost surely (otherwise, argue along subsequences). Then, we aim to prove that almost surely, $n^{1/6}(S^\star_{nk} - m_k)$ converges in distribution to the Gaussian law with mean zero and variance σ_k^2.

In each considered model, we define the bootstrap versions of f and F_{nj} as $\widetilde{f}_n$ and $F^\star_{nj}$ respectively, while the bootstrap version of M_{nj} is $M^\star_{nj} = F^\star_{nj} - \widetilde{F}_n$ with

$$\widetilde{F}_n(t) = \int_0^t \widetilde{f}_n(u) \, \mathrm{d}u.$$

From what precedes, a bootstrap version of assumptions (A0) and (A1) holds (we mean that conditionally on the original observations, these assumptions hold with f and F_{nj} replaced by their bootstrap version). Moreover, it can be proved following the line of reasonning used in the proof of Theorems 3,5,6 in [9], that a bootstrap version of assumptions (A2) and (A3) hold. The boostrap version $L^\star_j$ of L_j we consider in each considered model is given below.

1. In the regression model, $L^\star_j(t) = t\widehat{\tau}_j^2$ with $\widehat{\tau}_j^2$ the conditional variance of $\epsilon^\star_{ij}$. Let us notice that the conditional moment of order q of $\epsilon^\star_{ij}$ is equal to

   $$\mathbb{E}^\star|\epsilon^\star_{ij}|^q = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} |\widehat{\epsilon}_{ij} - \bar{\epsilon}_j|^q.$$

   Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, we have $\sup_t |\widetilde{f}_n(t) - f(t)| = o_p(1)$ so it follows from the law of large numbers that $\bar{\epsilon}_j = o_p(1)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, J$. Using again the law of large numbers we obtain that

   $$\max_{ij} \mathbb{E}^\star|\epsilon^\star_{ij}|^q = \max_{ij} \mathbb{E}|\epsilon_{ij}|^q + o_p(1).$$

Thus, we can assume here that $\max_{i,j} \mathbb{E}^\star|\epsilon^\star_{ij}|^q \leq C$ for some positive number C that does not depend on n, which is the main ingredient to establish the Bootstrap version of (A3) in the regression model. Likewise, we can assume that $\widehat{\tau}_j^2 = \tau_j^2 + o(n^{-1/3})$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, J$.

2. In the density model, $L_j^\star = \widetilde{F}_n$ for every j. Note that f is assumed bounded from above and from below, so thanks to (28) we can assume here that $\widetilde{f}_n$ is bounded independently of n from above and from below.

3. In the random censorship model, we still can assume that $\widetilde{f}_n$ is bounded independently of n from above and from below. Besides, we can assume that $\widetilde{G}_n(1) < 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\lim_{t\uparrow 1} H_{nj}(t) < 1 - \varepsilon$ for some positive number ε that does not depend on n, where

$$\widetilde{G}_n = 1 - \exp(-\widetilde{F}_n)$$

is the distribution function of the $T^\star_{ij}$'s. Now, the natural bootstrap version of L_j to consider is

$$t \mapsto \int_0^t \frac{\widetilde{f}_n(x)}{(1 - \widetilde{G}_n(x))(1 - H_{nj}(x))} \,\mathrm{d}x. \tag{94}$$

But the maximal heigth of the jumps of H_{nj} on $[0, 1)$ is of the order $O_p(1/n)$ and therefore,

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1)} |H_{nj}(t) - \widetilde{H}_j(t)| = O_p(1/n),$$

where $\widetilde{H}_j$ is the continuous version of H_{nj} (we mean, the polygonal function on $[0, 1]$ that coincides with H_{nj} at every discontinuity points of H_{nj} on $[0, 1)$ and such that $\widetilde{H}_j(1) = \lim_{t\uparrow 1} H_{nj}(t)$). One can then check that the bootstrap version of the embedding also holds with the bootstrap version of L_j defined by

$$L_j^\star(t) = \int_0^t \frac{\widetilde{f}_n(x)}{(1 - \widetilde{G}_n(x))(1 - \widetilde{H}_j(x))} \,\mathrm{d}x.$$

The advantage of this proposal as compared to (94) is that it has a continuous derivative that is bounded from below and from above.

Finally, with the above definitions of the bootstrap versions of f and L_j, the following bootstrap version of (A4) clearly holds in both regression and density models: there exist an $s \in (3/4, 1]$ that does not depend on n such that for all x, y, j,

$$|\widetilde{f}_n'(x) - \widetilde{f}_n'(y)| \leq |x - y|^s/\epsilon_n \text{ and } |L_j^{\star\prime\prime}(x) - L_j^{\star\prime\prime}(y)| \leq |x - y|^s/\epsilon_n.$$

In the random censorship model, $\widetilde{f}_n'$ satisfies the above Hölderian assumption, but $L_j^\star$ is not twice differentiable so the bootstrap version of the smoothness assumption on L_j is not satisfied. Instead, we have

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} |L_j^{\star\prime}(t) - L_j'(t)| = o_p(n^{-1/3}),$$

where L_j' is smooth.

Now that we have bootstrap versions of (A0),…,(A4), it can be proved, following the line of reasoning used in the proof of Theorems 1 and 2, that

$$n^{1/6}(S^{\star}_{nk} - m_k)$$

converges in distribution to the Gaussian law with mean zero and variance σ_k^2. This can be done at the price of additional difficulties which are mainly due to the facts that the bootstrap versions $\widetilde{f}_n$ and $L_j^\star$ of f and L_j depend on n, and $L_j^\star$ is less smooth than the original L_j in the random censorship model. Thus, we cannot use a Bootstrap verion of Lemma 9 in this model. However, here q can be chosen as large as we wish and B_{nj} is a Brownian motion (see assumption (A3)), so one can avoid the use of a Bootstrap version for Lemma 9 in this model and directly obtain

$$n^{1/3}\int_0^1 |\widehat{U}^{E\star}_{ni}(t) - \widehat{U}^{E\star}_{nj}(t)|\,\mathrm{d}t = n^{1/3}\int_{f(1)}^{f(0)} |\widehat{U}^{W\star}_{ni}(a) - \widehat{U}^{W\star}_{nj}(a)|\,\mathrm{d}a + o_p(n^{-1/6})$$

(where as usual, $\widehat{U}^{E\star}_{ni}$ and $\widehat{U}^{W\star}_{ni}$ are defined in the same manner as $\widehat{U}^{E}_{ni}$ and $\widehat{U}^{W}_{ni}$ respectively, just replacing the original observations with their bootstrap version in the definition), by using Lemma 5 in [9]. On the other hand, the presence of ϵ_n in the bootstrap version of (A4) does not cause any trouble thanks to the assumption that $n^{-\gamma}/\epsilon_n$ tends to zero as $n \to \infty$ for any positive γ. Nevertheless, the additional difficulties are not essential so, to alleviate the paper, we do not provide a detailed proof for the consistancy of the bootstrap.

It should be mentioned that the proof of Theorems 1 and 2 could be simplified if, instead of considering the general framework of Section 2, we restrict ourselves to one of models considered in Section 3; the proof of the bootstrap version simplifies in the same manner. For example, in the regression model as well as in the random censoring model, the embedding in (A3) is with a Brownian motion B_{nj} so the cases $S = B$ and $S = W$ coincide in these models; in particular, lemmas 10, 11 and 4 are pointless and there is no need to prove a bootstrap version of these lemmas. On the other hand, in the monotone regression model as well as in the monotone density model, the processes W_{t0} and $\widetilde{W}_{t0}$ coincide since the functions L_j's are proportional to each other, see (70) and (71). The proof thus simplifies a bit, and the same hold with its bootstrap version.

References

[1] Anderson, N. H., Hall, P., and Titterington, D. M. Two-sample test statistics for measuring discrepancies between two multivariate probability density functions using kernel-based density estimates. *J. Multivariate Anal. 50*, 1 (1994), 41–54.

[2] Aslan, B., and Zech, G. New test for the multivariate two-sample problem based on the concept of minimum energy. *J. Stat. Comput. Simul. 75*, 2 (2005), 109–119.

[3] Baringhaus, L., and Franz, C. On a new multivariate two-sample test. *J. Multivariate Anal. 88*, 1 (2004), 190–206.

[4] Bickel, P. J. A distribution free version of the Smirnov two sample test in the p-variate case. *Ann. Math. Statist. 40* (1968), 1–23.

[5] Cao, R., and Van Keilegom, I. Empirical likelihood tests for two-sample problems via nonparametric density estimation. *Canad. J. Statist. 34*, 1 (2006), 61–77.

[6] Cator, E. A. Local maxima of two dependent brownian motions never coincide. *Submitted.* (2012).

[7] Delgado, M. A. Testing the equality of nonparametric regression curves. *Statist. Probab. Lett. 17*, 3 (1993), 199–204.

[8] Durot, C. Sharp asymptotics for isotonic regression. *Probab. Theory Related Fields 122*, 2 (2002), 222–240.

[9] Durot, C. On the L_p-error of monotonicity constrained estimators. *Ann. Statist. 35*, 3 (2007), 1080–1104.

[10] Epps, T. W., and Singleton, K. J. An omnibus test for the two-sample problem using the empirical characteristic function. *J. Statist. Comput. Simulation 26*, 3-4 (1986), 177–203.

[11] Groeneboom, P. Estimating a monotone density. In *Proceedings of the Berkeley conference in honor of Jerzy Neyman and Jack Kiefer, Vol. II (Berkeley, Calif., 1983)* (Belmont, CA, 1985), Wadsworth Statist./Probab. Ser., Wadsworth, pp. 539–555.

[12] Groeneboom, P. Likelihood ratio type two-sample tests for current status data. *Submitted. See* `http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.4003` (2012).

[13] Groeneboom, P., Hooghiemstra, G., and Lopuhaä, H. P. Asymptotic normality of the L_1 error of the Grenander estimator. *Ann. Statist. 27*, 4 (1999), 1316–1347.

[14] Hall, P., and Hart, J. D. Bootstrap test for difference between means in nonparametric regression. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 85*, 412 (1990), 1039–1049.

[15] Harrington, D. P., and Fleming, T. R. A class of rank test procedures for censored survival data. *Biometrika 69*, 3 (1982), 553–566.

[16] Huang, J., and Wellner, J. A. Estimation of a monotone density or monotone hazard under random censoring. *Scand. J. Statist. 22*, 1 (1995), 3–33.

[17] Hušková, M., and Meintanis, S. G. Tests for the multivariate k-sample problem based on the empirical characteristic function. *J. Nonparametr. Stat. 20*, 3 (2008), 263–277.

[18] Ibragimov, I. A., and Linnik, Y. V. *Independent and stationary sequences of random variables.* Wolters-Noordhoff Publishing, Groningen, 1971. With a supplementary chapter by I. A. Ibragimov and V. V. Petrov, Translation from the Russian edited by J. F. C. Kingman.

[19] Janic-Wróblewska, A., and Ledwina, T. Data driven rank test for two-sample problem. *Scand. J. Statist. 27*, 2 (2000), 281–297.

[20] Jones, M. P., and Crowley, J. A general class of nonparametric tests for survival analysis. *Biometrics 45*, 1 (1989), 157–170.

[21] Jurečková, J., and Kalina, J. Nonparametric multivariate rank tests and their unbiasedness. *Bernoulli 18* (2012), 229–251.

[22] Kiefer, J. K-sample analogues of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Cramér-V. Mises tests. *Ann. Math. Statist. 30* (1959), 420–447.

[23] Kiefer, J., and Wolfowitz, J. Asymptotically minimax estimation of concave and convex distribution functions. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete 34*, 1 (1976), 73–85.

[24] Kim, J., and Pollard, D. Cube root asymptotics. *Ann. Statist. 18*, 1 (1990), 191–219.

[25] King, E., Hart, J. D., and Wehrly, T. E. Testing the equality of two regression curves using linear smoothers. *Statist. Probab. Lett. 12*, 3 (1991), 239–247.

[26] Kosorok, M. R. Bootstrapping the Grenander estimator. In *Beyond parametrics in interdisciplinary research: Festschrift in honor of Professor Pranab K. Sen*, vol. 1 of *Inst. Math. Stat. Collect.* Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH, 2008, pp. 282–292.

[27] Kruskal, W. H., and Wallis, W. A. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 47* (1952), 583–621.

[28] Kulasekera, K. B. Comparison of regression curves using quasi-residuals. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 90*, 431 (1995), 1085–1093.

[29] Kulikov, V. N., and Lopuhaä, H. P. Asymptotic normality of the L_k-error of the Grenander estimator. *Ann. Statist. 33*, 5 (2005), 2228–2255.

[30] Kulikov, V. N., and Lopuhaä, H. P. The behavior of the NPMLE of a decreasing density near the boundaries of the support. *Ann. Statist. 34*, 2 (2006), 742–768.

[31] Li, G., Tiwari, R. C., and Wells, M. T. Quantile comparison functions in two-sample problems, with application to comparisons of diagnostic markers. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 91*, 434 (1996), 689–698.

[32] Louani, D. Exact Bahadur efficiencies for two-sample statistics in functional density estimation. *Statist. Decisions 18*, 4 (2000), 389–412.

[33] Meintanis, S. G. Permutation tests for homogeneity based on the empirical characteristic function. *J. Nonparametr. Stat. 17*, 5 (2005), 583–592.

[34] Munk, A., and Dette, H. Nonparametric comparison of several regression functions: exact and asymptotic theory. *Ann. Statist. 26*, 6 (1998), 2339–2368.

[35] Neumeyer, N., and Dette, H. Nonparametric comparison of regression curves: an empirical process approach. *Ann. Statist. 31*, 3 (2003), 880–920.

[36] Præstgaard, J. T. Permutation and bootstrap Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for the equality of two distributions. *Scand. J. Statist. 22*, 3 (1995), 305–322.

[37] Revuz, D., and Yor, M. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, vol. 293 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.

[38] Sen, B., Banerjee, M., and Woodroofe, M. Inconsistency of bootstrap: the Grenander estimator. *Ann. Statist. 38*, 4 (2010), 1953–1977.

[39] Sen, B., and Chaudhuri, P. Mahalanobis's fractile graphs: Some history and new developments. *Technical Report No. R11, Indian Statistical Institute* (2010).

[40] Shen, W., and Le, C. Linear rank tests for censored survival data. *Comm. Statist. Simulation Comput. 29*, 1 (2000), 21–36.

[41] Smirnov, N. On the estimation of the discrepancy between empirical curves of distribution for two independent samples. *Bul. Math. de l'universite de Moscou 2*, 2 (1939).

[42] Wilcoxon, F. Probability tables for individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics 3* (1947), 119–122.

[43] Yatracos, Y. G. On the estimation of the derivatives of a function with the derivatives of an estimate. *J. Multivariate Anal. 28*, 1 (1989), 172–175.